

Library of

Wellesley



College.

Presented by Mr. A. A. Sweet

Nº 43336

THE EXPOSITOR.

VOL. III.

List of Contributors to Volume III.

- REV. PROF. T. G. BONNEY, SC.D., F.R.S.
REV. PROF. T. K. CHEYNE, D.D.
REV. SAMUEL COX, D.D.
PROF. FRANZ DELITZSCH (THE LATE).
REV. PROF. MARCUS DODS, D.D.
REV. PRINCIPAL J. OSWALD DYKES, D.D.
REV. PROF. W. G. ELMSLIE, D.D. (THE LATE).
REV. G. H. GWILLIAM, B.D.
PROF. VON HOFMANN.
REV. PROF. JAMES IVERACH, D.D.
REV. PROF. J. T. MARSHALL, M.A.
PROF. JOHN MASSIE, M.A.
RIGHT REV. J. J. STEWART PEROWNE, D.D.
REV. E. PETAVEL, D.D.
REV. PROF. C. PRITCHARD, D.D., F.R.S.
PROF. W. M. RAMSAY, M.A.
REV. PROF. W. SANDAY, D.D.
SIR G. G. STOKES, M.P., F.R.S.
REV. E. H. SUGDEN, B.A.

THE
EXPOSITOR.

EDITED BY THE REV.

W. ROBERTSON NICOLL, M.A., LL.D.

FOURTH SERIES.

Volume III.

London:
HODDER AND STOUGHTON,
27, PATERNOSTER ROW.

MDCCCXCI.

43336

BUTLER & TANNER,
THE SELWOOD PRINTING WORKS,
FROME, AND LONDON.

E5

410

E7

III.4

THE ARAMAIC GOSPEL.

INTRODUCTORY.

IN THE EXPOSITOR of last July there appeared an article from the present writer entitled, "Did St. Paul Use a Semitic Gospel?" That article was confessed to be a mere side-issue to a much wider theme of investigation; and though complete in itself, and of great importance, as seeming to prove that the words of the Lord Jesus existed in written form during the fifties of the first century, yet the stability of its positions must ultimately repose upon the establishment, on other grounds, of the wider question, Was the Gospel wholly or partially first written in Aramaic? If the reader was conscious of a slight *ὑστερον πρότερον* in the process of argument, it may perhaps be condoned by the fact that the order of discovery is not always the order of logic. The task then to which we wish to address ourselves in a series of articles about to appear in this magazine is *to prove the existence of an Aramaic Gospel embedded in our present Gospels, and to unveil its contents.* The method of research pursued in our investigations is certainly self-originated and independent, and though we shall occasionally come upon the track of other explorers, we shall for the most part strike out a path for ourselves.

But before we proceed to the exposition of our method, it will be desirable to lay before the reader certain facts relating to the Aramaic language and to the Aramaic Gospel mentioned by Papias, and also certain theories respecting these facts, so as to lead to a clearer understanding of

the entire subject. This preliminary matter we will throw into the form of answers to some brief and well-defined questions.

I. By whom was the Aramaic language spoken ?

The Aramaic language was spoken by the inhabitants of Mesopotamia and Syria; by the Mandeans, or Sabians, who lived in Assyria; by the Nabatheans, who at one time inhabited Petra and the Sinaitic Peninsula; by the Temanites of Northern Arabia; and, for at least two centuries before Christ, it was commonly spoken in Palestine. Besides this, for several centuries prior to the conquests of Alexander the Great, Aramaic held the proud position of being the medium of intercourse between monarchs, statesmen, and merchants over the whole of Western Asia. It was known to Rabshakeh the Assyrian (2 Kings xviii. 26), and also to the nobles of Jerusalem, but not, at *that* time, to the Jewish populace. Rabshakeh insisted, we find, on delivering his insolent message in the Jews' language, יְהוּדִית, so that all could understand him; whereas the Jewish nobles begged him to speak Aramaic, אַרְמֵית, that *they only* might understand. So also when the adversaries of Judah wrote to Artaxerxes to warn him of the danger of allowing Jerusalem to be rebuilt, Aramaic was the language in which the letter was written, and in which it is still extant (Ezra iv. 11-16), and the decree sent by Artaxerxes to revoke the former one was in the same language (Ezra vii. 12-26). Similarly, in the court of Nebuchadnezzar at Babylon, the one language in which the courtiers, drawn from so many conquered nations, made themselves understood to one another was Aramaic; as we find (Dan. ii. 4) when the Chaldæans came in to interpret the king's forgotten dream, they spoke אַרְמֵית. A misinterpretation of this verse has been the cause of much confusion all down the ages. Because the Chaldæan magicians spoke Aramaic, it has been inferred that that was the language of the *people*

of Chaldæa; and hence Aramaic and Chaldee have been used as convertible terms. Luther, for instance, translates אַרְמִית in Daniel ii. 4 "auf Chaldäisch," but in Ezra iv. 7 "auf Syrisch." As distinct from this supposed *Eastern* dialect, that of Syria and Palestine was called Western Aramaic, or Syro-Chaldaic. The cuneiform inscriptions have however revealed the fact that the language of Chaldæa, though cognate, was vastly different from Aramaic; and thus it is totally misleading for our Bible lexicons to be called "Hebrew and Chaldee" and for the Targums to be designated "*Chaldee* Targums." The wide difference between Aramaic and the language of Chaldæa is demonstrated, we say, from the inscriptions; but it might have been *inferred* from Isaiah xxxiii. 19 and Jeremiah v. 15, where we are told that the language of the Babylonians was one which none of the Jews could understand, whereas the Jewish nobles understood Aramaic.

A convenient *division* of the Aramaic dialects is (1) Syriac, (2) Mandaitic, and (3) Palestinian-Aramaic. It is convenient geographically, and it is also based on an important grammatical distinction; namely, that the regular pre-formative to the third singular future is, in the three dialects, ܢ, ܠ, and ܘ respectively.¹

II. What specimens of Palestinian-Aramaic have come down to us?

The specimens, as the name implies, are chiefly Jewish. The Aramaic portions of the Bible are Daniel ii. 4 to vii. 28; Ezra iv. 8-16, vii. 12-26; and Jeremiah x. 11. The Book of Tobit also exists in Aramaic, in a unique MS. in the British Museum, which has been edited by Dr. Neubauer; but our chief documents are the Targums. When the Jews ceased to understand Hebrew, and the

¹ For further information, the student is referred to Kautzsch's *Grammatik des Biblisch-Aramäischen*, and Dr. Wright's *Comparative Grammar of Sinitic Languages*.

vernacular was Aramaic, it became a practice in the synagogues, in reading the law, to allow an interpreter, verse by verse, to translate the Hebrew into the vernacular. At first the interpreter was not allowed to *read*, he must utter his translation orally; but in course of time a guild was formed, and the translations became more uniform, until in the first or second century A.D. some one master-mind produced, as a "deposit" of the work of his colleagues and predecessors, the so-called Targum of Onkelos. This Targum is in every sense the most valuable; and, with the exception of some subtle evasions of biblical anthropomorphisms and of phrases adjudged to be derogatory to the Divine dignity, it is a remarkably accurate translation. There is in existence also a paraphrase of the Pentateuch; that is, a very free translation, embellished with legendary lore. This is of much later date than the Targum of Onkelos, and contains many Greek words. It exists in two recensions, known as the Targum of Jonathan and the Jerusalem Targum. Equally paraphrastic are the Targums on most of the rest of the Bible; except Proverbs, which is a fairly literal translation.¹ The Samaritan Targum² on the Pentateuch is also in Aramaic, but with an admixture of foreign words from various sources. The specimens of the so-called Palestinian-Aramaic *outside* the Holy Land are (*a*) some papyrus fragments and stone inscriptions written by Aramaeans and Jews who sojourned in Egypt, some of which belong to the fifth century B.C.; (*b*) the inscriptions found in Tadmor (Palmyra); (*c*) some interesting Temanite inscriptions in North Arabia; and (*d*) the Nabathean inscriptions on rocks and tombs in Petra, Sinai, and the Haurân. Some specimens of the last two are given

¹ The Jews of Wilna have issued the Pentateuch in five small volumes, with Targum and Rabbinic commentary. This is a fact worth knowing, as the Bibles of Bomberg and Buxtorf are difficult to meet with.

² Dr. Brüll has brought out in cheap form an edition of the Samaritan Targum in Hebrew square letters. (Frankfort.)

by Dr. Neubauer in a valuable paper included in *Studia Biblica*.

III. What are the peculiarities of Aramaic, as compared with Hebrew?

Hebrew and Aramaic belong evidently to two distinct groups of the great Semitic family. This fact has been very imperfectly recognised. Eichhorn, for instance, in advocating his theory of a Syro-Chaldaic *Urevangelium*, constantly used Hebrew by way of illustration;¹ and even Dr. Roberts speaks of Aramaic as "a Hebrew *patois*."² Hebrew and Aramaic are cognate, but too unlike to be placed in the same group. The group to which Hebrew belongs contains also Phœnician, Canaanite, and Moabite. But what is very remarkable is, that there is grave reason for doubting whether any of these peoples spoke this language *originally*. The Phœnicians are said in Genesis x. to be a Hamitic people; and their love of the sea, their skill in trade and manufacture, and their city-life distinctly declare them to be non-Semitic: and yet all their literary remains are in a dialect closely akin to Hebrew; so that they must have been immigrants, adopting the language of the aboriginal inhabitants. The Phœnicians called themselves Kenaani, and thus were the same people as the Canaanites; and consequently *both* were immigrants.³ As for the Abrahamidæ, the evidence is not so strong; but if Abram's cousins in Haran were Aramæans (Gen. xxv. 20, xxviii. 5), and if Laban, as a good Aramæan should, called "a heap of witness" שְׂדֵרֵי־תֵּא (Gen. xxxi. 47), had not Abram spoken the same language 150 years before? If so, the Abrahamidæ and Moabites were Aramæans, and adopted the Hebrew language from the older inhabitants "who were then in the land."

¹ *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, vol. i.

² THE EXPOSITOR. First Series. Vol. vi., p. 81.

³ This view is ably advocated by Dr. Schrader in Riehm's *Handwörterbuch*, art. "Phönicien."

But to return. When the Hebrew student takes up the Targums he finds himself in another field. This is not the place to dilate upon the *grammatical* differences; but the absence of the prefixed article, the rareness of the construct state, the disappearance of the "Vav conversive," and the totally new conjugations will at once attract attention. And what strikes him more is, that some of the *verbs* which are most frequent in Hebrew are no longer to be seen. Such verbs as לָקַח, to receive, דִּבֶּר, to speak, and עָשָׂה, to do, are conspicuous by their absence. Perhaps the most remarkable thing is the thorough change in the simple verbs of "rest" and "motion." עָלָה, to "go up"; יָרַד, to "go down"; בּוֹא, to "go in"; יָצָא, to "go out"; and עָמַד, to "stand," are not to be found in Aramaic. So also the verbs of "leading," אָשִׁיר, נָחַה, and נָהַל; of "fleeing," נִיס and חָסָה; of "departing," סוּר, זוּר, and סוּג, have no equivalent in Aramaic.

The science of Comparative Philology has made many interesting disclosures as to primitive culture and local origin by examining what words the members of a class of languages possess in common, and in what they differ. The former denote, of course, the words in common use *before the dispersion*; the latter, the words which each people required to invent or borrow *after the dispersion*. I am not aware that this method has hitherto been applied to Hebrew and Aramaic, but the results are worthy of note. Both have the same name for "God"; for "sea"; for the ordinary relatives; for the domestic animals, sheep, camel, horse, and cattle; and even for "ploughing" and "sowing": but when we come to words descriptive of *locality*, we find an important diversity. Both have the same words for "plains" and level ground: בִּקְעָה, "a wide plain between two mountain ranges"; מִישֵׁר, "downs"; שְׁפֵלָה, "lowlands"; and מִדְבָּר, "a steppe," are all common to both: but to designate a "mountain," Hebrew uses

two words, הָר and נְבִיעָה, neither of which is found in any other Semitic tongue; and the Hebrew words for "valley," עֵמֶק, "ravine," גַּיא, "cliff," סֶלַע, are none of them found in Aramaic; yet they have the same words for "river," נָהָר and יַבֵּל. From these facts we infer that the common home of the two peoples was not a mountainous country.

Then as to their *social condition*. They have both the same word for "dwelling," בַּיִת; but the words for "wall," גִּדָּר, חוֹמָה, and הַיֵּץ, are not Aramaic words. The Hebrew word קִיר, "a wall," is connected with the Aramaic קִרְיָא, "a city"; but both come from a root meaning "to dig," which shows that the *cities* before the dispersion had "walls" of earth. As for collections of water, they have the same word for "fountain," עַיִן; for "pool," אֲגָם, and also for "well," בְּאֵר (Aram., בִּירָא). This, taken along with the fact that they have common words for "ploughing" and "sowing," shows that when the Aramæan and Hebrew parted company, they were living in much the same condition as Abram and Lot. Their residence together does not seem to have been embittered by warfare, for each language has its own word for "fighting"; and of the Hebrew words meaning "to kill" or "slay," the following six words, הָרַג, מָטַח, פָּרַח, שָׁחַט, רָצַח and זָבַח are without equivalent in the more peaceful Aramaic. As to the four points of the compass, the Hebrew tongue fixes its own locality by using יָם, "sea," for "west"; and נֶגֶב, "the desert," for "south." Aramaic of course does not use these words, but designates the east, south, and west by terms which denote respectively the rising, brilliance, and setting of the sun. Thus the Aramaic language does not fix its own locality—presumably there was nothing remarkable in its boundaries. As we have seen then, the evidence indicates that the common home of the Hebrew and Aramæan was a great plain, and that it was the Hebrew who emigrated. It is probable that this plain was that

of the Euphrates; but it is perhaps premature to decide on this, until scholars have come to an agreement as to whether the primitive seat of all the Semites was in Arabia or Mesopotamia.

IV. What explanation can be given of the fact that the vernacular of the Jewish people changed after the captivity from Hebrew to Aramaic?

Mr. Deutsch, in Smith's *Bible Dictionary* (vol. iii., p. 1638), gives the usual explanation of the gradual decay of the Hebrew vernacular in the fact that during the captivity in Babylon the Jewish exiles "enjoyed full liberty of intercommunication with the natives, and were utterly unrestrained in the exercise of every profession and trade," and hence became quite "familiar with the Aramaic." Yet he does not seem to have been satisfied with this theory, for in the article on "Semitic Languages" in Kitto's *Cyclopædia*, he says that the captivity, even allowing for successive batches of immigrants from Babylonia, "does not quite account for the phenomenon of a seemingly poor and corrupt dialect supplanting so completely the other, hallowed by the most sacred traditions, that this became a dead language even in its own country." He then confesses that "the fact has not been sufficiently explained as yet." That is twenty-five years ago, and many things have been made clear since then. But there is one thing which was accessible to Mr. Deutsch which he failed to notice, and that is, that even when the Jewish exiles had been home for a century, they still spoke in the *Jewish* tongue; for in the days of Nehemiah (chap. xiii. 24) the inhabitants of Jerusalem ordinarily spoke יהודית. Clearly then they *had not* learned Aramaic in Babylonia; and the deciphering of the cuneiform inscriptions has shown that they *had no facilities* for doing so; for though Aramaic was spoken at court, yet the language of Babylonia was more like Hebrew than Aramaic, and very unlike both.

Further, we now know that it was on the soil of the Holy Land that the Jews learned Aramaic; for (1) the inscriptions of Petra have disclosed that the so-called Arabians (*i.e.* desert-rangers), of whom Geshem (or Gashmu) was chieftain, and who appear with the Samaritans in the very precincts of Jerusalem, first deriding and then opposing the efforts of Nehemiah to rebuild the city, were really Nabatheans, speaking the Aramaic language. Ewald, in his *History of Israel*, maintains that it was during the exile that the Nabatheans vanquished Edom, and began to establish themselves in the deserted cities of Judah. Thus the returned exiles were exposed to Aramaizing influences on the south. And (2) on the north it was equally so. We find in 2 Kings xvii. that the colonists sent to dwell in the depopulated towns of the northern tribes came from the towns of Babylonia¹ and from Hamath.² Now the Hamathites, though originally a Hamitic people, most probably spoke Aramaic. But besides this, the cuneiform inscriptions also narrate that the Sargon who dismantled Samaria sent the remnants of several conquered tribes of Northern Arabia into Samaria³—tribes which were akin to the Temanites, and who with them had paid tribute to Tiglath-pileser II. But it has, as we have said, recently been discovered that the Temanites spoke Aramaic, and therefore we infer that the kindred tribes which were sent by Sargon “to the land of the house of Omri” also spoke Aramaic. In this way (along with the dominant influence of Syria during the Seleucid period) do we account for the historic fact that Samaria and Galilee came to speak Aramaic as the vernacular. Thus the returned exiles were immigrants wedged between two Aramæan peoples; and consequently, first Judæa, and then Jerusalem, gradually succumbed: so

¹ Compare Schrader's *Cuneiform Inscriptions and the Old Testament*, vol. i., p. 268.

² Schrader, *op. cit.*, p. 273.

³ *Op. cit.*, p. 269 seq.

gradually, that they retained the name ἡ Ἑβραϊσὶς διάλεκτος for the speech of the Jewish people, even after they spoke Aramaic. That this *is* so is clear from the fact that, though every specimen of Semitic extant in the New Testament is Aramaic, yet Ἀραμαϊστί never occurs, and the words Bethesda, Golgotha, and Gabbatha, all Aramaic forms, are all said to be Ἑβραϊστί. Dr. Neubauer is of opinion that Jerusalem did *not* succumb to the Aramaizing influence, but that in the days of Christ the populace spoke a modernized Hebrew. His reasons are given at length in *Studia Biblica*, vol. i., p. 45 seq., and they certainly prove that new-Hebrew was spoken by the *learned*. But there is one fact which Dr. Neubauer has overlooked when he maintains that the *popular* dialect of Jerusalem was Hebrew; and that is, that the field in which Judas committed suicide was called (Acts i. 19) by the inhabitants of Jerusalem *in their own tongue* (τῇ ἰδίᾳ διαλέκτῳ) Ἀκελδαμά. But this is Aramaic, אַקְלְדָּמָא, “field of blood”—the Hebrew for “field” being אֵרֶבֶת. This seems to prove that even in the holy city the *people* spoke Aramaic.

V. In what language did the Saviour deliver His discourses? Is it probable that He was able to converse both in Aramaic and Greek?

This is a question of deep interest to every Christian, and the more one loves the Lord Jesus as a personal friend the more wishful will he be to know decisively. The all but unanimous testimony of scholars is that He spoke Aramaic. This was certainly the vernacular of Galilee, and the few Semitic words spoken by our Lord which are left embedded in the Greek of our present Gospels are all Aramaic. These are words which were felt to be too precious to be translated; and though they are few in number, they are amply sufficient to show that, even if the Saviour could speak Greek, yet Aramaic was the language of His home and of His heart. The names Boanerges

(Mark iii. 17) and Cephas (John i. 42), given to the three favourite disciples, are Aramaic. And when Jesus took the deaf and dumb man aside privately (Mark vii. 34), and "looked to heaven and sighed," the language of the sigh was an Aramaic word, אֲתַפְתָּח, which is, for euphony, transliterated ἐφφαθά. And when the Saviour stood over the lovely form of that child of twelve summers in the house of Jairus, and the heart of Jesus spoke in its native tongue to that which was innermost in the reviving child, He used the Aramaic words טָלִיתָּא קוּמִי "Maiden, arise." In Gethsemane He used the precious word Ἀββᾶ (אַבְבָּא); and when, as the Mediator, He hung upon the cross, the words of despair which He uttered, linked as they are so essentially with the great vicarious purpose of His death, are left, as too precious to translate, in the very words in which they were spoken, אֵלִי אֵלִי לָמָּא שְׁבַקְתָּנִי, Eli, Eli, lama shabaqtani? This is pure Aramaic. The word שְׁבַק does not occur in Hebrew at all, but its *import* may be gathered from such passages in the Targums as these: Ruth i. 16, "Entreat me not to *leave* thee"; Psalm xxxvii. 25, "I have not seen the righteous *forsaken*"; ver. 28, "The Lord loveth judgment, He *forsaketh* not His saints." The fact that our Lord quoted Psalm xxii. 1 in Aramaic shows, that, even if we may not infer that the Targum had been committed to writing thus early, it was the Aramaic form of the psalm which had endeared itself to the Saviour's heart.

It is well known that there have been some few scholars who have maintained that Christ habitually spoke Greek. In the first series of this magazine there was an interesting controversy between Dr. Roberts and Dr. Sanday on the subject. Dr. Roberts must certainly be admitted, as the result of much research, to have brought to light many neglected facts to prove the prevalence of Greek in the Holy Land. He shows that the conquests of Alexander introduced a new leaven into oriental life. Greek supplanted

Aramaic as the one language of commerce, and as such was spoken by tradesmen and artisans; and many also among the nobles were fascinated by the new pleasures which Grecian civilization opened up for them, and adopted Greek names and Greek dress. To my mind, Dr. Roberts has *proved* "that Christ spoke Greek"—i.e. was *familiar* with the Greek tongue; indeed, I intend to bring forward a new line of reasoning which seems to prove that *some* of the sayings of our Lord are preserved to us in the very words in which they were spoken. One could wish one had been more successful in this search. It would be a pleasanter task to prove that *all* the sayings of Christ recorded in our Greek Gospels are "the *ipsissima verba* which proceeded out of His mouth," than to prove that those *words* have been lost; yet the stern logic of facts leaves us no other recourse than to admit that the discourses of the Saviour were, for the most part, delivered in the Aramaic vernacular—in the mother-tongue—the language in which love speaks to love and heart to heart. We intend however to prove also that the precious words were at a very early period committed to writing, and that each of the synoptists in his account of our Lord's discourses translated from this Aramaic document; and it is not a hopeless wish that in those passages which the three synoptists have in common, the Greek *may* be re-translated into the very words the Saviour used. What a gain this would be to sound scholarship, as well as to theology, we need not pause to describe.

VI. What evidence have we that the discourses of the Saviour were, in the first instance, written in Aramaic?

The earliest testimony on this subject is to be found in a quotation from Papias given by Eusebius in his *Ecclesiastical History*. Papias was bishop of Hierapolis in Phrygia in the earlier half of the first century, and he says that he learned from John the presbyter that "Matthew compiled

the oracles in the Hebrew (? Aramaic) language, and each one interpreted them as he was able" (*Ματθαῖος μὲν οὖν Ἐβραϊδὶ διαλέκτῳ τὰ λόγια συνετάξατο, ἡρμήνευσε δ' αὐτὰ ὡς ἦν δυνατὸς ἕκαστος*). There are not many texts of Scripture which have been more controverted than this brief statement. First of all, we have a "various reading," which however does not affect the sense seriously. Many of the Germans read *συνετάξατο*, while our English scholars give *συνεγράψατο*, the difference being that of "compiling" and "composing." Then it is disputed whether Papias knew of a Greek Matthew; but the aorist *ἡρμήνευσε* is usually, and correctly, regarded as indicating that the time when the Aramaean Matthew was used was already long past, and probably if the *δε* clause were forthcoming it would allude to the translation. Most important is the dispute as to the meaning of the word *λόγια*. On the one hand, scholars of very different schools restrict the word to its classic import, and hold that the Aramaic Matthew was "simply a collection of discourses," "the oracular or Divine utterances of the Lord Jesus"; while others regard our Greek Gospel as merely a translation from the Aramaic. Dr. Lightfoot, for instance, in his *Essays on Supernatural Religion*, appeals to Romans iii. 2, where the whole Old Testament is called *λόγια*; he also quotes from Philo and Clement, who use the word as synonymous with "the Scriptures": and hence infers that the Aramaic *λόγια* mentioned by Papias comprised our entire Greek Gospel. But our surest guide as to the meaning in which an author uses a word is to consult the author himself: and when we find that Papias composed a work, *Explanation of the Oracles of the Lord, Λογίων κυριακῶν ἐξηγήσεις*, and that this consisted largely of an interpretation of the discourses of Jesus; confirming (?) *διαβεβαιούμενος*, his interpretations by sayings more or less fabulous, which he claims to have traced to the circle of the apostles; and when we find that Papias, in comparing

the Gospels of Matthew and Mark, speaks of the latter as containing τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἢ λεχθέντα ἢ πραχθέντα, "the things said or done by the Christ," and says also that Mark, in contrast with Matthew, does not give a σύνταξις τῶν κυριακῶν λογίων (or λόγων), i.e. "a compilation of the oracles of the Lord,"—we must admit that the word λόγια, as used by Papias, means chiefly the Lord's discourses; though it might also include a brief narrative of the events which served as a setting for some of our Lord's most important utterances, and apart from which they are unintelligible. It is our intention to advance a method which will serve as a touchstone to decide on the contents of the Aramaic *Logia*, and we shall find that it contained almost all the discourses of Jesus and some of the narratives in a condensed form. And as to the connexion between the Aramaic Matthew and our present first Gospel, we believe that our Greek Gospel is a second and enlarged edition of the Aramaic, written after the lapse of some years, when the Church had begun to realize that it is not the words of Christ merely that demand our attention, but that His life and works are also Divine oracles, revealing to us the Father.

Papias is not the only Church Father who records that Matthew wrote a Gospel τῆ Ἑβραϊδι διαλέκτῳ. Pantænus, who preached among "the Indians," says that Bartholomew had preceded him, and left there the writing (γραφῆ) of Matthew in Hebrew letters. Further testimonies on the subject are collected by Meyer on *Matthew*, pp. 4-8.

VII. What theories have hitherto been held as to the probability that Mark and Luke used the Aramaic Gospel in the compilation of their "Memoirs"?

To answer this question fully would be a tedious and a thankless task. Theories on this subject have sprung up on the fertile soil of Germany, like the fabled warriors from the teeth of the dragon on the soil of Bœotia, meeting with the same fate—mutual destruction. But it should be borne

in mind, that if ever the knotty problem of the synoptic Gospels is to be solved, it must be by the resuscitation of some theory thought to be effete; for every *possible* theory has been advocated, and every one has also been stoned and dragged out for dead. We will restrict ourselves then to some of the most important of these theories. The first great name which claims attention is that of Eichhorn, who thought he had discovered the contents of the Syro-Chaldaic *Urevangelium* in the forty-four sections which the synoptists have in common. Whatever is found in all the three Gospels belonged in his judgment to our Aramaic Gospel, written about the time of the stoning of Stephen. This primitive document was circulated, and was gradually expanded in three different districts by different authors, and then each was translated into Greek. The use of some two of these secondary documents by the synoptists explains the cases where *two* of them agree; while other documents had to be sought as the source of the passages in which each of our evangelists stands alone. Led on by the criticism of opponents, Eichhorn was continually discovering fresh *Urkunden* in a somewhat arbitrary way, considering himself called upon to specify the document from which each verse in our synoptists had been culled. The theory of Eichhorn caused an immense sensation throughout Germany for some years, but the excessive ingenuity and arbitrariness of its later accretions caused it to fall into disrepute. Its chief fault was its dead mechanism. It made the Gospels a mere mosaic of pre-existent materials. It allowed too little for prevalent peculiarities of style in each Gospel, for the independent idiosyncrasies of apostles and apostolic men, still less for inspiration. It quite ignored the fact that each Gospel has its *raison d'être*; that each evangelist was supernaturally endowed with a sublime conception of Jesus and His work; and that in the choice of materials, the arrangement of details, the

omission and insertion of incidents, each evangelist was dominated by his own divinely given conception of the Christ. The Tübingen school of some twenty years later was a reaction against this stolid mechanism. It sought for a *raison d'être*, and was so far right; but was wrong in finding it in a supposed antipathy between the Pauline and Petrine sections of the Church.

The next great scholar that we would name as having investigated the Papiian Matthew is Schleiermacher. He came to the conclusion that the *Logia* was nothing more than a collection of our Lord's sayings; and also that the proto-Mark was not nearly so large as our Mark, but simply the notes which Peter gave to Mark, and thus our Gospels are not in either case the writing to which Papias refers. He was opposed by Weisse, who shows that Papias' description of Mark answers admirably to our canonical Mark. Then came Knobel, who held that the Aramaic *Logia* and the canonical Mark were the two oldest independent documents, and the sources from which chiefly our Gospels of Matthew and Luke were compiled. Meyer maintains that the Aramaic Matthew was gradually expanded by the interweaving of historical matter. Thus enlarged, it was translated into Greek, and became our first Gospel. In its Aramaic form it was used to some extent by Mark and Luke. Mark was written before Matthew was enlarged, and the author of the canonical Matthew (who was not Matthew himself) made use of Mark. Then comes Weiss who claims to have improved on his predecessors in two ways: (1) in the discovery that the *Logia* contained many narratives in addition to the discourses of our Lord. (2) As Meyer, he held that Mark and Luke had the *Logia* before them in writing—not however in Aramaic, but in a Greek translation.

Thus we see that there is a strong body of opinion that the common matter of the synoptists was taken from a

written source ; and we see that several scholars of the first rank have maintained that the Aramaic *Logia* was translated into Greek by each of the three synoptists. This is the conclusion to which we also have come by thoroughly independent investigation. There is a *counter-theory*, first advocated by Gieseler, which, through Bishop Westcott's influence, has been extensively adopted in this country, and has recently been presented in fully developed form by the Rev. Arthur Wright. This is the theory of *oral tradition*. The advocates of this view remind us of the fact that the memoirs of Christ's life were recited in the Church by the catechists, and committed to memory by the catechumens; and they seek to explain the variations in the homologous matter of the synoptists by two human imperfections: (1) the necessarily variant account which different equally-credible witnesses would give of the same incident; and (2) the imperfection of human memory in transmitting orally the same discourse. The great objection usually urged against this theory is, that it does not explain the agreement of our Gospels, which is not simply one of words, but sometimes "extends to finishing touches and details of expression, as also to its introductory and transitional formulæ, and in many cases continues throughout long speeches and even series of narratives such as could never have been transmitted in oral tradition" (Weiss: *Introduction*, vol. ii., p. 209). We wish to add a more forcible objection to the theory of oral tradition. If it can be shown, as we hope to do, that the variations in the common matter of the synoptists are, in numerous cases—and we hope to bring forward more than sixty—due to a variant translation of a common Aramaic original, then the theory which would explain them by the errancy of oral tradition must be admitted to be inadequate, if not untenable.

J. T. MARSHALL.

ON THE TITLE, "SON OF MAN."

A LITTLE work has recently appeared, *The First Three Gospels, their Origin and Relations*, by the Rev. J. Estlin Carpenter, the modest and unpretending form of which hardly does justice to the character of its contents. This is indeed the one thing that I should most regret about it. The book is addressed, in my opinion, to an inappropriate public. It is published in a series of "Biblical Manuals," under the auspices of the Sunday-school Association (Unitarian). It may therefore be inferred that it is intended for the young. And for the highest class of young pupils it is in many respects excellently fitted. It is written with a clearness of development and a flowing ease of style which draw on the reader and prevent his interest from flagging. There is just the right degree of warmth about it. It is elevated in tone, without being stilted or rhetorical. Even one who does not sympathize with the author's point of view, and who cannot profess to be indifferent to his conclusions, will find them presented with as little unnecessary friction and aggressiveness as possible.

These are considerable merits, and the author is fully entitled to the credit of them. The drawbacks are: First, as I have said, that the book is addressed to a wrong public. Books for the young are not the proper field for critical experiment. They should be confined to ascertained and acknowledged fact. Theories which depend upon critical premisses should first be threshed out in the schools before they are taken down into the highways and hedges. They should first be propounded in a form in which they can be adequately discussed and tested. The writer should have before his eyes the wholesome knowledge that he is writing for scholars who will not allow his statements and theories to pass unquestioned. It seems to me that Mr. Carpenter's book has distinctly suffered from the fact that this has not

been the case. Much of it is not really suited to the young, and if it had been submitted in the first instance to those for whom it is suited, it would, I think, have been written differently.

This is the second qualification that I should have to make in regard to it, that it looks at first sight critical in a higher sense than it really is. I do not refer merely to certain unguarded expressions, such as on p. 115, where it is assumed without a hint of doubt that the last words of Mark i. 1, "The beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ [the Son of God]," are an interpolation, although they are wanting only in a single uncial MS. (N), and although their omission (supposing them to be genuine) might be due to one of the commonest of accidents. I do not say that the omission has nothing to be said for it; but the right verdict is doubtless that of Drs. Westcott and Hort, that "neither reading can be safely rejected." It is a more serious matter when we find a sentence like this on the fourth Gospel: "The rich background of nature and society, the variety of occupations, the manifold touches which reveal the teacher's close and loving observation of his countrymen, are merged in a few great and universal ideas, *in whose glow all local colour has been blanched away.*" The first orthodox commentary on the Gospel that is taken up—Dr. Westcott's or Dr. Plummer's—will show that this is the very reverse of the fact.¹ The fourth Gospel is really full of local colour, and to deny this is to give a wholly misleading aspect to the evidence on one of the most fundamental questions.

The synoptic Gospels are less dangerous ground, and Mr. Carpenter gives a critical analysis of these to which little exception can be taken. His last three chapters are indeed a welcome sign of the progress which is being made towards agreement on this head. The Gospel of St. Mark is placed

¹ *Speaker's Commentary*, p. v ff.; *Camb. Greek Test.*, p. xxvii ff.

about the year 70 A.D., and that of St. Luke some ten years later, both very probable dates. And if there is a tendency to bring too far down the latest touches in the Gospel which bears the name of St. Matthew, it is acknowledged that the mass of the materials of which it is composed are older. The whole of this part of the case is stated with moderation, and I should myself feel that it would not be difficult to arrive at an understanding about it. It is however rather strange, and perhaps not without significance, that the chapters dealing with this side of the subject are the last in the book. They come in rather as an ornamental appendage to the reconstruction of the history than as the foundation on which it is based. And accordingly we find that the critical determination of the sources has had less to do with the main body of the book than might have been expected. It needs, in fact, little reading between the lines to see that certain dominant ideas are present to the mind of the author throughout, and that his decision on particular points is far more affected by them than by any strictly objective documentary standard. There looms before him a dim ideal of what he conceives that the Christ ought to be; and if the Gospels do not of themselves yield exactly that ideal, they must be corrected into accordance with it.

This is to me another disappointing feature in the book. It claims to be critical, and it uses a critical language; but when it comes to be looked into, the criticism will be found to be far more subjective than objective. And, as a consequence, it will satisfy the author himself, and those of his own way of thinking, more than others who differ from him. An example may be seen in the appendix dealing with the title "Son of Man," which contains the central and distinctive idea towards which a great part of the volume may be said to be working. The treatment of this title is, to the best of my belief, new and original; and although I

cannot regard it as at all tenable, it may yet seem to deserve some closer examination.

Mr. Carpenter's idea is, briefly stated, this: He thinks that our Lord did not really use the title in the sense attributed to it in the Gospels. He would link on the actual use to the context in which it originally occurs in the book of Daniel. It will be remembered that the first instance in which the phrase occurs in any exceptional sense is in connexion with the vision of the four great monarchies: the first represented by a lion; the second, by a bear; the third, by a leopard; the fourth, by a monster with iron teeth and ten horns. The Ancient of days takes his seat upon the throne of judgment; the last of the beasts is destroyed, and the others deposed; and there comes with the clouds one "like unto a son of man," who is brought before the Ancient of days, and receives a dominion which is universal and eternal.¹ There is some little divergence in the interpretation, especially of the second of these symbolical creatures; still there is no doubt that they stand for a succession of monarchies, according to the most common view, the Babylonian, Median, Persian, and Macedonian, or the empire of Alexander and his successors. In contrast with these, the Form "like a son of man" represents, no doubt, in its primary significance, and in the horizon of the prophet, the idealized, regenerated, purified Israel. From a Christian point of view it is not wrongly transferred to Him who embodied and fulfilled the ideal vocation of Israel.

Mr. Carpenter however—quite reasonably from his standpoint—adheres to the primary application to a regenerated Israel. He thinks that the use in the Gospels grew directly out of this. The "Coming of the Son of Man" he takes to be a synonym for the triumph of "the kingdom," that great social change and renovation to which there can be

¹ Dan. vii. 1-14.

no doubt that Jesus looked forward. In more than one passage the equation is found in the Gospels, "Coming of the Son of Man," = "coming of the kingdom" (*e.g.* in Mark ix. 1 = Luke ix. 27 = Matt. xvi. 28). These passages Mr. Carpenter takes as a key to the explanation of the rest; and he skilfully works out the view that, wherever personality is ascribed to the Son of Man, this is due to a misunderstanding of the real teaching of Jesus. What He said impersonally the Church, at a very early date, understood personally. Starting from the belief that Jesus was the Messiah, His disciples soon came to refer what was meant for the Messianic people to the Messiah Himself. Hence the existence of a number of passages in the Gospels in which Jesus is made to speak of Himself when in point of fact He did not do so; hence in particular the appropriation of a large group of sayings in which mention is made of the "Coming of the Son of Man," from the inauguration of an age of righteousness, or coming of a righteous people, to the personal coming, or Second Coming, as we are in the habit of calling it, of the Messiah.

I have said that this hypothesis is skilfully worked out, but I do not for a moment believe that it is true. It involves, as will be seen at once, a wholesale rewriting of the Gospels. It is no doubt the case that there is one important group of passages in which the title "Son of Man" is specially connected with this future or Second Coming. There is no great difficulty in re-interpreting these in the sense desired. But there is also a number of other passages which are broken up entirely by the attempt to force any such meaning upon them. These have to be got rid of by less legitimate methods.

No very great straining is indeed involved in the explanation of the question in Matthew xvi. 13 ("Who do men say that the Son of Man is?") as a simple periphrasis for "that I am" which is found in the other two Gospels. Nor is

it in itself difficult to account by this expedient for the occurrence of the phrase in the predictions of the passion, although the persistent way in which it is repeated on all the four occasions where these predictions are uttered (St. Mark viii. 31, ix. 9, 12, 31, x. 33) cannot fail to arrest attention and arouse some misgiving.

Mr. Carpenter does not allow that these predictions were so precise as they are made to be. He thinks that Jesus knew the risks He was running, and that He deliberately faced them; but the definite predictions he would explain rather as "the Church's apology for Messiah's death. The stumbling-block of a crucified Christ was removed if it could be shown that he had himself predicted his end in conformity with ancient prophecy."¹ But then he goes on to attribute a delicate tact to those who first gave shape to the traditions, which makes a larger demand upon our opinion of them.

"But why should Messiah be here designated 'Son of Man'? Because in the formation of the tradition the language assigned to Jesus accommodated itself to his historic utterances. Now the synoptic Gospels never represent him as designating himself as the Messiah. He does not repudiate the title when it is offered him, but he carefully refrains from assuming it; the official designation is never on his lips. It was impossible then that the Church should exhibit Jesus as habitually employing a name which he carefully avoided; and the Messianic feeling therefore had to embody itself in some other term which could find a sanction in his own practice. Such a term was ready in the name 'Son of Man,' which had been employed by Jesus to describe the immediate advent of the 'kingdom' in which God's will should be done on earth as it was in heaven."²

I leave it to the reader to say how far a procedure of this kind—at once so bold in its recasting of one set of facts and so sensitive and scrupulous in its regard for another—was probable in the circles in which the Christian tradition was formed in the middle of the first century.

But however this may be, there are other cases which are

¹ *The Synoptic Gospels, etc.*, p. 374.

² *Ibid.*

more intractable. One such comes early in the synoptic narrative, and is deeply seated in the triple tradition. In the healing of the paralytic at Capernaum our Lord pronounces an absolution over the sick man and then heals him, claiming the right to forgive sins as the "Son of Man." Mr. Carpenter objects to this that it "involves the conception of a causal connexion between the sin and the disease which it is difficult to believe that Jesus really entertained," and that it is contrary to the view implied in His question about the eighteen on whom the tower of Siloam fell.¹ But is there no connexion between sin and disease? Is there any reason why there should not have been such a connexion in this particular case? The catastrophe at Siloam is not parallel. A further objection is, that the part about the forgiveness of sins comes in as a parenthesis. It is a parenthesis (in St. Mark) of some six verses, and is found, as we have seen, with remarkable closeness of language in the other synoptics. It therefore goes back as far as the documents can take us, and clearly belonged to their common original. Incidents like this are needed to sustain the charge of blasphemy; and the mere fact that one part of a narrative is separable from the rest by no means proves that it ought to be separated.

Another example follows soon after this. Our Lord supports the act of His disciples in plucking the ears of corn, not only by the precedent of Abiathar, but also by laying down the principle that "the Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath," to which, according to St. Mark, He adds the further corollary, "so that the Son of Man is Lord even of the Sabbath." A natural and appropriate climax, say we, to whom the title "Son of Man" presents no difficulties: "exceedingly unsatisfactory" is Mr. Carpenter's verdict; but the difficulty in his eyes is clearly not critical, but dogmatic.

¹ Page 378.

It is not surprising that the passages against which a criticism of this kind is directed are many of them those which Christendom specially values.

"Whosoever would become great among you, shall be your servant: and whosoever would be first among you, shall be servant of all. For verily the Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give His life a ransom for many" (Mark x. 43-45).

It is observed upon this that, while St. Matthew is in almost complete verbal agreement with St. Mark, he introduces

"the saying about the Son of Man with 'even as' instead of 'for.' But the very fact that the phrase receives this introduction¹ awakes the suspicion that we are presented rather with a comment or reflection of the narrator than with a word from Jesus; and it contains a reference to the mystic efficacy of his death which shows at once what is the significance of the name 'Son of Man,' and appears to be due rather to the interpretation of the Church than to the word of the teacher. The equivalent in the third Gospel, Luke xxii. 27, 'I am among you as he that serveth [ministereth],' is much more direct."

According to the critical analysis, the presence of a phrase in two out of the three authorities decides its claim to acceptance as representing the common original of all three. Mr. Carpenter himself appears to recognise this principle;² but he ignores it altogether when it comes into collision with what he considers *à priori* probability, *i.e.* with anything that favours the thesis which he aims at proving.

No better foundation seems to underlie the rejection of Luke xix. 10, the commendation of Zacchæus: "To-day is salvation come to this house, forasmuch as he also is a son of Abraham. For the Son of Man came to seek and to save that which was lost."

It is admitted that it cannot be proved, but at the same time suggested as "not improbable, that some original utter-

¹ The ancients were less careful than we are in preserving causal connexions. For instance, in the Latin versions *enim* and *autem* are frequently treated as almost interchangeable.

² Pages 264, 266.

ance of Jesus has been cast by the Church into this form, and that the phrase has grown out of the effort to portray Messiah as the world's redeeming power, the Saviour even of the lowest of mankind." We cannot help asking, Whence came that effort? It certainly was not prompted by the current Jewish conception of the Messiah; and it can hardly have been derived from any other source than the teaching of Jesus Himself.

There is more that is attractive in the acute observation that the mention of blasphemy "against the Son of Man" in Luke xii. 10 (=Matt. xii. 32) may possibly have arisen from misreading of an original which had the "sons of men" ("all their sins shall be forgiven unto the sons of men"), as in the parallel context of St. Mark. But here we have again the agreement of two of the synoptic columns against the third; so that we should have to believe that the same misreading lay behind each. And if there is a questionable element in the passage about the sign of Jonah (Matt. xii. 40=Luke xi. 30), that element is contained, not in the allusion to the Son of Man ("so shall the Son of Man be [a sign to this generation]"), which is common to both accounts, but rather in the expansion of this which is found in St. Matthew.

It will have been seen that too many of the examples quoted above are not only not suggested by the critical analysis, but directly opposed to it. The temptation has been too strong to choose, not that form of a saying which approves itself as most original, but that which lends the most support to the hypothesis which is being advocated. Mr. Carpenter, I cannot but think, has been progressing too fast. He has formed his theories too soon, and allowed them to mix themselves with his statement of the facts. I can only see in the result a confirmation of what I have long held, that in order to get at any sound conclusion about the synoptic Gospels we need to execute a "self-

denying ordinance," and for some sufficient period of time exclude all theories of this higher sort, involving the supernatural, whether in the way of affirmation or of denial; and that we should confine ourselves strictly to the critical problem of ascertaining what is the absolutely earliest form of the tradition, and by what steps and gradations other later forms are built up round it. We have Mr. Rushbrooke's *Synopticon*, but we have not yet that series of close and minute studies for which it ought to furnish the text. And pending the prosecution of those studies, I would respectfully invite the authors of "biblical manuals" such as that of which I am speaking to think twice before they engage in what may be a spreading broadcast of error.

It must not however be supposed that my sole objection to the particular theory before us is that it involves the re-writing—and the premature re-writing—of the Gospels. Another group of reasons, historical rather than critical, tells in the same direction. There is one marked omission in Mr. Carpenter's argument. He says nothing (in this connexion) of the Book of Enoch. Probably the simplest interpretation of this silence is that he sets down the passages implicated as of Christian origin. The view is that of a minority of critics: still it is held by Dr. Drummond in his *Jewish Messiah*; and I can quite understand his colleague sharing the opinion. The point is however important, not to say vital, in its bearing upon the whole question. Perhaps this is another instance in which the exigences of a school manual have interfered with the proper scientific discussion of a problem which demands science. If the so called "parables" in the Book of Enoch are pre-Christian, then the whole conditions of the problem are different. In that case it cannot be questioned that the title "Son of Man" was already applied, before Jesus used it, to the personal Messiah. Here for instance is a passage which excludes all doubt upon the subject:

"There I saw One who had a head of days [*i.e.* was old], and His head was white like wool; and with Him was a Second, whose countenance was like the appearance of a man, and His countenance was full of grace, like one of the holy angels. And I asked one of the angels who were with me, and who showed me all the secrets, concerning this Son of Man, who He was and whence He was, and why He goes with the Head of days. And he answered and said to me: This is the Son of Man who has justice, and justice dwells with Him; and all the treasures of secrecy He reveals, because the Lord of the spirits has chosen Him, and His portion overcomes all things before the Lord of the spirits in rectitude to eternity. And this Son of Man, whom thou hast seen, will arouse the kings and mighty from their couches, and the strong from their thrones, and will loosen the bands of the strong, and will break the teeth of the sinners," etc. (Book of Enoch xlvi. 1 ff.).¹

There are several other passages equally explicit, and all much to the same effect. Schürer places the chapters in which they are found about the time of Herod the Great. He argues that there is nothing in them which is not entirely explicable on Jewish premisses; that they are either wholly Jewish or wholly Christian, the hypothesis of interpolation being inadmissible; but that if they are Christian, the wonder is that they are not *more* Christian, as they speak of the Messiah only as coming in glory and for judgment, and do not give a hint of any other coming in a state of suffering and humiliation.² This seems to me, I confess, sound reasoning. There is nothing to identify this Judge of quick and dead with the historical person of Jesus of Nazareth.³ We may observe further that judgment is threatened mainly against heathen potentates and tyrants and not upon individuals. This is exactly in accordance with the temper of the Jews, who consoled themselves for the oppression from which they suffered by

¹ I have followed the translation from the Ethiopic by Schodde (Andover, 1882), except for one slight verbal alteration.

² *Neutest. Zeitgesch.* ii. 626.

³ Dr. Drummond admits that this is "a formidable difficulty" (*Jewish Messiah*, p. 61), and therefore does not assert that the "parables" as a whole are post-Christian, but has recourse to the hypothesis of extensive interpolation. Allowance should in fairness be made for the possibility of this.

the prospect of seeing their cause avenged; but it is far less in accordance with the spirit of primitive Christianity.

I think therefore that the balance of probability is decidedly in favour of the pre-Christian origin of the passages in question. But I incline to this view still more because of what appears to be the excellent historical sequence if we assume that to be the case. If we suppose that the title "Son of Man" was already attached to the personal Messiah before the coming of Christ, then it seems to me that all the facts fall beautifully into their places. Mr. Carpenter takes up the very paradoxical position that Jesus accepted undoubtedly Messianic titles when they were applied to Him by others, and also (if I understand rightly) that He was Himself conscious of a Messianic calling; but that He never spoke of Himself directly as the Messiah unless it were in the one character as "Servant of Jehovah."¹ In other words, he will not allow the name "Son of Man," which our Lord is made to give to Himself in all the Gospels, and he will allow the name "Servant of Jehovah," which He does not explicitly give to Himself in any of the Gospels, although it was undoubtedly given to Him by primitive tradition.² Let us make the contrary assumption, and see with what a delicate felicity and appropriateness the standing title in the Gospels is chosen. I take it that among the Jews at the Christian era, at least among such as shared the lively expectations which were then abroad of the great deliverance which was approaching, it was distinctly understood that the "Son of Man" meant "the Messiah." At the same time it was not a common title, because the ordinary usage of the phrase "son of man" in the Old Testament pointed to that side of human weakness and frailty which

¹ See p. 125.

² Cf. Matt. xii. 18; Acts iii. 13, 26, iv. 27, 30; Clem. Rom. *Ad Cor.* lix. 2, 3, 4; *Doct. XII. Apost.* ix. 1; *Mart. Polyc.* xiv. 1, 3.

the zealots of the day least cared to dwell upon in the King for whom they were looking. But the very reason which led them to avoid the title induced our Lord to take it. It expressed His Messiahship definitely enough for His purpose; but it expressed it in that veiled and suggestive way which characterized the whole of His teaching on His own person. At the same time, it conveyed to those who had ears to hear the whole secret of the incarnation. That which the Jews shrank from and ignored He rather placed in the forefront of His mission. He came as the representative of humanity, not militant and triumphant, but in its weakness and suffering. He was made in all points like as we are, though without sin; so that we might not have a High Priest who cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities, but who can bear gently with the ignorant and erring.¹ He entered into human nature, and took it as a whole. That very side of it which men were wont to disparage and to try all they could to escape from He made peculiarly His own. He did so, not only in order to make it the point of contact, the recipient and conductor for His own boundless love and sympathy, but also in order to show that through it lay the true path of salvation; to demonstrate in act as well as in word that he that findeth his life shall lose it, and he that loseth his life shall find it; that the true disciple must take up his cross; and that even an apostle must learn that when he is weak then is he strong.

We note then, running through our Lord's use of this title two veins of meaning side by side. On the one hand, the Son of Man is He who shall come in the clouds of heaven and judge all nations. On the other hand, it is as Son of Man that He mingles in the innocent festivities of life, as "eating and drinking," though in the same capacity He "has not where to lay His head"; it is as the Son

¹ Heb. iv. 15, v. 2.

of Man that He forgives sins, and comes to seek and to save them that are lost; it is as the Son of Man that He foretells His own passion. Other names bring out His other aspects as the Logos, face to face with God from all eternity; as the Son of God, who alone is admitted to the innermost counsels of the Father; as the Son of David, born of the royal lineage, and claiming His royal prerogative; as the anointed Prophet, as well as King; but there is none like this which so touches the tender place in the hearts of men, or which so explains the paradox of victory through suffering: "I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men unto Me."

Lastly, the form and manner in which the phrase is used,—the very rhythm, we might say, of the sentences in which it is found—stamp it as original. It was natural enough that the seers in the Book of Daniel and in the Book of Enoch should speak as they do of the Son of Man in the third person; but it was by no means so obvious that the Messiah should consistently adopt this objective way of referring to Himself. Surely we have here one of those individual and characteristic touches which make the figure of Christ, for all its universality, stand out in the Gospels with such distinctness. It is a touch no less individual than that by which the fourth evangelist at once conceals and reveals his own identity. We may indeed be pardoned for the conjecture that on this point the disciple has not been unaffected by the example of the Master. And it is equally striking that as in the fourth Gospel the term "Logos," though used by the evangelist, is never put into the lips of the Lord, so throughout the New Testament the term "Son of Man" is reserved for the Lord Himself, with the single exception of the exclamation of St. Stephen.¹ But it is another matter when we are told that this scrupulously consistent, and beautifully harmonious and significant usage

¹ Acts vii. 56.

is all due to a misunderstanding, and that it is the work, not of Christ Himself, but of the early Church. Many of us will doubt the power of the popular imagination to produce effects so much above its own level. But indeed on all grounds the hypothesis seems to be an untenable one. The texture of the Gospels is too closely knit to allow room for it by any process of critical elimination, and to introduce it is to make the history of the founding of Christianity less coherent and less intelligible.

W. SANDAY.

THE PRAYER OF FAITH.

“But let him ask in faith, nothing wavering. For he that wavereth is like a wave of the sea driven by the wind and tossed. For let not that man think that he shall receive anything of the Lord. A man of two minds, he is unstable in all his ways.”—JAMES i. 6-8.

BEFORE we enter on the main theme of these verses there are two critical points to be noted, to each of which we must give a moment's attention. St. James says that the man of dubious or double mind must not expect to receive anything of “*the Lord*.” Now on the lips of any other Apostle, “the Lord” would stand for the Lord Jesus Christ. On *his* lips it stands for God, the Father Almighty, as we may see by comparing ver. 5 with ver. 7: “If any of you lack wisdom, let him ask of *God*”; “Let not that man think he shall receive anything of *the Lord*.” Obviously “the Lord” of the latter verse is the “God” of the former. Here then we have a new indication that St. James remained a Jew after he became a Christian. Unlike the other Apostles, he used this term “the Lord” in the Jewish sense, as it was used by the Hebrew prophets. With him, as with them, “the Lord” stood for Jehovah, not for Jesus.

Again, St. James had another Jewish habit. The Hebrew

poets were fond of playing on words in a double sense. So was St. James, as we shall have to note again and again. But he is not responsible for the pun on "wave" and "wavering" in ver. 6. That is due to our translators. There is nothing to warrant it in the Greek, which is, quite accurately, rendered in the Revised Version, "Let him ask in faith, nothing *doubting*: for he that *doubteth* is like the *surge* of the sea driven by the wind and tossed." I have retained the older rendering of the Authorized Version simply because the pun is quite in St. James's style, and in translating it is well to maintain an author's characteristic style so far as we can.

And now for our main theme—the sequence of thought contained in these verses.

"Man is born to trouble, as the sparks fly upward": so at least we often say; so Job said. But, at the most, the saying is only a half truth. It would be quite as true to say, "Man is born to joy, as the birds to sing," and even more true. Before his troubles came upon him in such blinding succession and force, Job himself, translating his own experience into abstract forms, would have said, "Man is born to tranquillity, enjoyment, peace." And, after the Lord had "turned his captivity," and given him "twice as much as he had before," he saw and acknowledged that it was good for him to have been afflicted, that out of his sorrow there had come a truer, finer joy. We are too apt to follow his example, and judge the lot of man from our own; and even in judging of our own lot we commonly fall into two mistakes.

First, when the keen edge of pain is pressed on our hearts, we forget how much there is in life, and even in our own life, that is bright and cheerful; how fair the world is in which we live; how much kindness we receive from our friends and neighbours; and how many opportunities we have of showing them kindness and of doing them good.

When we are troubled by *the cares* of home, we do not for the moment remember through what large spaces the common charities and pleasures of home have nourished our hearts and made them joyful. When we are troubled by the cares of business, we do not for the moment remember how much we have gained from business, how much of wholesome occupation, how much training in manliness, in tact, in power to deal with men; we forget how miserable we should have been if we had had no daily task to occupy and steady and brace us. When we lose one whom we love, we do not for the moment remember how many are left to love us; in the keen sense of how much we have lost in losing him, we forget that here, in our very loss, is a new opportunity of proving that we were not unworthy of his love, if only we nerve ourselves to serve those who were as dear to him as to us, instead of indulging in an unavailing grief. We sigh, "Man is born to trouble!" and forget, for the time, how much tranquillity and joy the days have brought us. And thus, before we are aware, we libel God, the Giver of all good, and even assume that it is pious to utter this libel on His goodness!

The second mistake we make is in not discerning that trouble itself is designed to conduct us to the true joy, the supreme good of life. The most valuable of all possessions is, as we have seen, a pure and noble character, a perfect and entire spiritual manliness. Even while we are on earth our happiness depends far more on our character than on our outward conditions; for men of high and fine spiritual character are happy in all conditions, from the lowest to the highest, from him who has not where to lay his head to him who has not where to bestow his goods. And when we die, when we leave this world, our character still more directly determines our fate. Of all that we have we can only take *this* with us—our character and the fruits it has borne, whether in the habits it has formed for us, or in the

deeds it has prompted us to do. We shall take our habits with us, and our works will follow us. Clearly, then, our main task in life is to form in ourselves that noble and complete character which is the mainspring of happiness both here and hereafter. If you were about to emigrate to the antipodes, and of all your possessions there was only one which you could take with you, and that the very thing which had most promoted your well-being before you started, would you account yourselves wise were you to bend your attention on everything else, and neglect only that? But we *must*, all of us, soon emigrate to another world. There *is* only one of our possessions that we can take with us—our self, our personality, our character, such as we have made it. Can it be wise of us, then, to attend to everything but this, to anything more than this? Is it wise to be for ever pursuing gains that we must leave behind us, without much regard to their effect on character; or pleasures, the very faculty for which we shall lose when we die; or so to live among our friends as not to make sure that we shall meet them again beyond the sea, in the new world to which we go?

If we were wise, we should take the counsel of St. James, and make *character* our supreme end and aim. We should welcome whatever will help us to be “perfect and entire, lacking nothing.” We should count it all joy when we fall into the divers trials by which we are made constant in our fidelity to God—to truth, *i.e.*, and righteousness and charity; and thus we should acquire the divine art of extracting joy from trouble itself, and a cheerful strength from the painful tests to which we are kindly exposed.

“But,” it may be said, “such wisdom, though we crave it, is beyond most of us. It is high; we cannot attain unto it.” With what comfort, then, should the assurance come home to our hearts, that, if any of us lack wisdom, lack *this* wisdom, we have only to ask it of God, and He will give

it to us, and give it without upbraiding us either for asking so much, or for not having asked it before! How welcome should be the assurance that God will give us the very wisdom for which we sigh, and which seems beyond our reach, not because of any virtue or desert on our part, but simply because He is God the Giver; because He gives to *all*, and not only to us; because, in His boundless goodness and bounty, He *must* give, and still give, and give again, just as the sun must shine.

We are very ingenious in tormenting ourselves, and often, when at last we have learned what the true wisdom of life is, and have come to long for it, and have even asked God for it, we mournfully conclude that He will not hear our prayer, either because we are not worthy, or because we have asked amiss. Let us therefore lay to heart the promise of St. James: "If any of you lack wisdom, let him ask of God, who giveth to *all* men, *with simplicity* (i.e. without reserve, without duplicity, not keeping the word of promise to the ear, only to break it to the hope), *and chideth not, and it shall be given him.*"

We shall need all the comfort we can get from this assurance, and from the fact that it is based on the very nature of God Himself; for the holy Apostle goes on to warn us that in one way we may ask amiss, ask so as not to obtain, even when we are asking wisdom to form our character and guide our lives aright. God is the Giver, indeed. He lives only to impart Himself, to bless us with all good. But even He cannot give us a good we will not take; or rather, He may and does give it to us, but He cannot compel us to use it for our good; and if we do not use it for good, we must abuse it to our own hurt and be all the poorer for His bounty.

God gives as the sun shines, on the evil and on the good; but it is only the good soil that takes the benefit of its light and heat. Nay, more, bold as it may sound, I

will undertake to show that God *has* given, given to each one of us, this very wisdom—wisdom to mould character and guide life aright—for which we nevertheless ask, and do well to ask, Him. *He* has it who uses it, and he who uses it not; we all have it, however imperfectly we act upon it. For is there any one of us who does not see at times, is there any one of us who does not see at this moment, that to have a noble and complete character formed in us, to become perfect and entire men, such as Jesus was, is our highest conceivable good—highest in life, in death, and in the life to come, the good which is both most valuable in itself and most enduring? But if we do, we all *have* the wisdom we ask, though we do not use it to the full. The defect is not in God, the Giver, but in us, the askers.

What is this defect then? How comes it to pass that, longing for the true wisdom of life, asking for it, having it, we yet feel as though we had not received anything of the Lord? St. James suggests the answer. We are men of *two* minds instead of men of one, and therefore we are as unstable as water, nay, as *foam*, and do not reach the excellence for which we sigh. Even when we pray for wisdom, we waver in our choice. If we crave wisdom, we also crave an ease, a gain, an enjoyment which is inconsistent with wisdom and the use of it. Instead of being like a mighty river which steadfastly presses on its way, sweeping all obstacles before it, we are like a wave of the sea, driven and tossed now this way, now that, the sport of every wind that blows. This is that fatal flaw in our nature which defeats our endeavours after true wisdom. We are not of a single heart, we are not of one mind, we are not of an undivided will in our high quest.

Now is not that true? St. James does not charge us with hypocrisy, with pretending to a goodness we do not possess, or with feigning a desire for goodness we do not feel. He simply charges us with vacillation, with incon-

sistent aims and desires. "Oh, yes," he seems to say, "you want to be good, want it quite sincerely; but then you want many other things as well. At times you want them more. You shrink from the effort which goodness involves. You know it is wise and right, the true wisdom, the one duty, to serve God and your neighbour, and you wish to do it; but at times you shrink from the trouble of leaving your room and your book to serve a neighbour, or from the thought and emotion without which you cannot worship God. You sincerely desire to carry your religion into your daily life; but you cannot always be at the pains to control your temper, or you have not the courage to discountenance a dishonest custom, or to refuse a profit which can only be obtained in doubtful ways."

This, and such as this, is what the Apostle means when he reminds us of our instability, our two-mindedness, of the fickleness of our hearts, of our divided wills. Elijah had the same thought in his mind when he upbraided the Israelites with the challenge, "How long halt ye between two opinions?" or, more exactly, "How long halt ye between *two paths*?"—one foot on the higher path and one on the lower, so that they made little way, and were thrown into a distorted and ungainly attitude.

We all know what the Prophet, what the Apostle meant, for we have all limped on Elijah's two paths; we have all been as waves on St. James's sea, now rising toward heaven, now sinking toward the abyss. Or, only slightly to change the figure, we have all wavered on the waves, as Peter did when, no longer keeping his eyes on Christ, he began to sink. Like him, we have had our minds distracted between trust and fear, between love for the Master and self-love. "Wherefore didst thou *doubt*?" said Christ to Peter; *i.e.* "Why become a man of two minds? Why suffer your thoughts to be drawn in two opposite directions—*toward Me*, and yet *away from Me*?" And to us St.

James says: "Do not doubt; do not suffer your minds to be distracted by the contending claims of flesh and spirit, of heaven and earth, of time and eternity: or, though you ask for the best things, you will not, *because you cannot*, receive anything of the Lord. He *will* give you wisdom if you ask it, for He gives to *all*; but what will you be the better for wisdom if you do not use it?"

What we want, in order to attain decision of will, unity of character, is *faith*, or more faith, in the spiritual and eternal realities, to have our hearts more fully set on them, to be quite sure that they are worth more than all the goods of time, and that we may possess and enjoy them, even in these fleeting hours of time. And therefore it is that St. James bids us, if we lack the true wisdom, *ask* for it *in faith*, nothing doubting. The fact is, that we do doubt, that we do not fully and heartily believe. We get weary and ashamed of limping awkwardly on our two paths; we grow sick of being tossed to and fro between our better and our inferior desires; and we ask God to give us wisdom to choose the better part, to take and keep the higher path, to maintain a settled and onward course. But even as we ask, even when we are in our best moods, do we quite want to break once for all with the world? do we see no flower we long to pluck which blooms only on the lower path? Alas! we ask for decision itself with an undecided heart, not expecting, nor altogether wishing, to receive a full and immediate answer to our prayer, not braced and prepared for the effort it would take to grasp that answer, should it come.

Is there no remedy, no real help for us? Will *nothing* induce or compel us to choose God and truth and goodness with all our hearts? Will nothing persuade us to make the formation of a noble and harmonious character our supreme aim, and to follow it with a single and an undivided will? Shall we never make it our chief and stead-

fast endeavour to be true and upright and kind in all we do, and with all our strength? Many of us are so sick of our indecision, of being divided in will and aim, that we say we would willingly make any sacrifice in order to have done with it, that the sense of unity may be brought into our hearts and lives, that we may always be doing one thing, and that the best. And sometimes God takes us at our word. He sends the divers tribulations which make us feel how unable the things of sense and time are to satisfy the soul, how uncertain our hold of them is. He convinces us, by arguments which rend our hearts, that we cannot rest in any earthly good, however pure and sweet it may be; or that, if we could rest in it, we cannot be sure of having it long. And thus, painfully yet most graciously, He teaches and constrains us to seek first the things which lie beyond the reach of change, and which *can* satisfy us, even though we should lack all else. Truth, righteousness, charity, fellowship with the Father and with His Son, the hope of becoming one with all the wise and faithful and good, and of meeting all whom we love in a world in which there will be no change, save the changes which will bring us nearer to each other by bringing all nearer to God—these now become our aim, our strength, our joy. The very sorrows we most dreaded have made us men of one mind, and will in due course make us perfect and entire, lacking nothing. We still love the beautiful world around us, and the friends who have long been dear to us, and the necessary or honourable tasks assigned us, and the pleasant recreations and enjoyments permitted us. We love them more than ever: but we love and value them most of all, not for what is outward and visible in them, but for what is inward and invisible; for the help they yield us to become brave and true and gentle, for the opportunities they afford us of helping others to walk after the spirit, and not after the flesh. We love this beautiful world most of all

when it speaks to us of the beauty of its Maker. We love our common and public tasks, not so much for the gain we make by them, as for the good we may do by them, the contribution we tender to the general welfare. We love our friends, not so much for any personal comfort or ease we may get out of them, nor because they cast back on us a softened and flattering reflection of ourselves, but rather because they are helping us, and we are helping them, to live the true life, to pursue the chief good. And, imperfect as we all are, there are many of us who really do value our friends in proportion as they aid us to be our best selves, and invite us into those upper chambers of the soul in which we find it so hard to abide.

When we pray for wisdom, then, wisdom to guide our lives toward high spiritual ends, we may be sure that God will give it. But we may be sure too that, with the wisdom, He will send the trials which will constrain us to accept and use it. When the trials come, we must bear them; for who can escape the hand of God? But shall we not also take the wisdom they bring with them? Shall we not suffer them to redeem us from our indecision, from halting and wavering between the supreme eternal good and a good that is only temporal and will change with time? Shall we not count it all joy if by these trials we are made men of one mind, and have that mind fully and wholly bent on God, and on the joy and peace which are to be found in Him, and in Him alone?

There is but one way to escape the trials which are so painful to us. And it is this: To make them unnecessary, by an instant, voluntary, and entire devotion to the true aim, the supreme good, of life. Because God loves us, and *will* make us perfect and entire, He must and will send us any sorrows, losses, pains necessary to detach our hearts from the inferior objects and aims on which they are too apt to settle. His very love for us compels Him to compel

us to choose the better part. If we would avoid the pain of compulsion, we must freely choose the better part for ourselves. So long as we halt between two, and waver this way and that, we must not expect, we dare not hope, to escape the trials which will make us of a single heart and an undivided will. When those trials come, let us remember for what they come, what an end of mercy, that so we may be able to rejoice in tribulation itself, knowing that by tribulation God is constraining us to bring forth all the peaceable fruits of righteousness and love.

S. Cox.

GENESIS AND SCIENCE.

INTRODUCTORY NOTE.

THREE eminent men of science¹ have, at my request, furnished me with their opinions as to the possibility of establishing an agreement between the statements in the first chapter of Genesis and the certain and well-ascertained results of modern scientific investigation.

I am glad to say I have their permission to publish the papers and letters in which these opinions are expressed, and they now appear as an appendix to the "Notes on Genesis" in successive numbers of *THE EXPOSITOR*.

J. J. STEWART PEROWNE.

PROFESSOR STOKES ON GENESIS.

I.

DEAR MR. DEAN,—

Some of the questions you ask me are rather for a theologian to answer than for a scientific man, especially one who does not know Hebrew. I think perhaps I had best, in the first instance, mention what on scientific

¹ Sir G. G. Stokes, M.P., F.R.S., President of the Royal Society; Rev. C. Pritchard, D.D., F.R.S., Savilian Professor of Astronomy in the University of Oxford; Rev. G. Bonney, Sc.D., F.R.S., Professor of Geology in University College, London.

grounds seems likely to have been the history of the earth, and then refer to your specific questions.

Huggins' discovery of the gaseous nature of many of the nebulae has revived the belief in the probable formation of stars by the gradual condensation of matter previously disseminated in an attenuated form. In different nebulae and stars we seem to see successive stages of condensation. First, we have a nebula without, or almost without, a stellar point, the spectrum of it showing that it was not solid or liquid matter, but matter in a gaseous, or it may be ultra-gaseous state. Then we have a mixture of the two, a nebula with spectrum indicative of gas, and one or more stellar points, which seem to be so connected with the nebula as to render it very improbable that they are stars having no relation to the nebula, but are merely situated casually in a line with it as seen from the earth. Then we have nebulous stars, where the stellar point forms the chief part of the whole. And, lastly, which is the commonest case, stars without sensible nebulosity.

Now here we seem to have regular gradation, beginning with incandescent gas, or ultra-gas, and going on to a definite star, that is a distant sun.

The luminosity of the nebulae leads to the inference that the ultimate molecules are in a state of internal agitation. This is continually being spent by communication to the ether, and would cease before long if not renewed. Its renewal we attribute either to the vibrations consequent on chemical combination, or those resulting from collisions which do not eventuate in chemical combination, but leave the molecules free after encounter as they were before. In either case we look on the internal vibrations which are the source of the light as a result, and we are led therefore to the contemplation of a possible still earlier condition of things, in which the ponderable matter would exist, but would not be luminous, and in which therefore, if all the

matter in it were in that condition, the universe would be without light. It may be that in the interstellar spaces, or outside nebulae, there is still matter in this condition; but if so, our senses give us no means of ascertaining its existence. The production of light would be therefore the first visible stage of progress. The sources of this light, instead of being concentrated into brilliant suns, would be diffused over gigantic spaces.

If we fix our attention on any one nebulous system in process of condensation, and suppose the initial motions of its parts,—the motions, that is, at a time which we please to take for our starting point, arbitrary,—then the chances would be infinity to one that the mass, as a whole, would have a motion of rotation. Into the precise mathematical meaning of what I have thus expressed in short compass I need not enter. It might well therefore be that, as the contraction proceeded, portions of the matter would, from time to time, be left behind by the retreating mass, gravitating towards it, but being prevented from falling into it by their tangential velocity, causing them to go round the central mass like an assemblage of minute planets, which would, as a general rule, collect into a single mass. Or rather, perhaps the ring of gaseous matter left behind by the contracting gaseous matter within would collect into a still gaseous mass, circulating like a gaseous planet not yet condensed, and the condensation would be subsequent to the collection. Such a mass on cooling and contracting might similarly in the process of condensation leave rings behind which would collect into satellites. In the case of Saturn we seem to have, not only a set of satellites, but also a ring of matter which condensed into a number of minute discrete bodies, instead of one, forming a ring which is in reality composed of a number of rings, instead of a single globe, or a succession of such globes.

Take now one of these primaries, say the earth. If it

condensed from nebulous matter, it would at first be at an extremely high temperature. Arguments have been derived from the figure of the earth, that it was originally in a state of fusion. Among the constituents of our earth we have a large quantity of water, some two-thirds of its surface in its present state being covered by sea, with an average depth say of two miles. While the earth was still extremely hot, this would be in that sort of nondescript condition, above the "critical temperature" of Andrews, in which, as Andrews showed, there is a continuous passage from what everybody would call liquid to what everybody would call gas, *i.e.* steam. There would be a continuous transition in the condition of water-substance from a very dense state at the surface of the earth to a rare state high up. At the outskirts of the atmosphere the temperature would, at least after a time, be below the "critical point," and there would be a mantle of cloud.

On further cooling, the surface of the earth would get below "critical point" for water. I do not recollect what this temperature is, but it is far above the boiling point. When the temperature had fallen below this, there would be a definite upper surface to liquid water, above which we should have a mixture of air and vapour of water, which in the upper region would condense and fall in torrential showers of intensely hot water. As the cooling went on, the distinction between the liquid and gaseous water would become more and more marked; the quantity of liquid water, at first small, would greatly increase, forming seas, and the temperature of the sea and falling rain would become moderate. At last the cooling might be sufficient to permit of the introduction of vegetable life. Vegetable must of course precede animal life, since all animals live, immediately or mediately, upon vegetable food.

Meanwhile the condensation of the nebular matter inside the earth's orbit would have been going on, and the

matter would come to have a stellar centre, and would ultimately collect into a sun with a definite outline. Considering the minuteness of the earth's mass compared with that of the sun, and the slowness of the condensation, it seems probable that the earth would have made considerable progress in its cooling, and what depends upon it, before the luminous matter inside its orbit would have collected into a definite sun.

The first mention we have in the record of animal life is in relation to the waters, and the earliest fossil animal remains are those of marine creatures. As to an objection which, if I rightly remember, Huxley raised, that whales are mammals, and that mammals belong to a later geological age, I do not know Hebrew, nor, I presume, does Huxley; but whatever the word may mean, it cannot, I think, mean whales. For whales are denizens of the Arctic and Antarctic seas, coming down a bit into the temperate regions; and the Hebrews in all probability knew nothing about them, and would not therefore have a word to denote the creature.¹ The word, I suppose, means some big marine creature, and the saurians are such, which stand high in geological time, though, as I do not know geology, I cannot tell you how high. Winged reptiles, which a non-scientific person might well call fowls, come pretty early. Respecting the relative order of fowls proper and mammals, I am not geologist enough to tell you. However mammals, I know, come late, and there is no evidence of anything in the way of a new form coming after man.

I do not therefore think that there is any opposition between the account in Genesis and what we learn from science, provided of course we do not insist on a slavish literalism, which I look on as a mere creation of theological

¹ I have already shown, in the December number of *THE EXPOSITOR*, that the word does not mean "whales," but is a general term for any kind of huge marine animals.—J. J. S. P.

fancy. On the contrary, the accordance seems to me closer than, from a theological point of view, I should care to demand.

Now for specific questions.

1. The extreme literalism which demands "day" to mean twenty-four hours seems to me to slay itself. For what we mean by day is the interval from sunrise to sunrise, or sunset to sunset; and there could be nothing of the kind before there was a sun at all.

2. The general order of succession in Genesis seems to agree with the teachings of science; but I am not aware that you can fix on definite geological periods answering one to one with the days of Genesis.

3. Difficulty in the existence of light before the sun? Answered by anticipation.

4. Meaning of "made" in the account of the fourth day. See above.

5. Creation of the earth before that of the sun and moon? As to the sun, see above. As to the moon, the less important luminary would naturally be mentioned along with the more important; and I think it is only a slavish literalism which would demand that the creation should be simultaneous because they are mentioned together.

6. Order of creation? See what was said in the first part of this letter.

I do not recollect specifically Huxley's objections; but as well as I recollect they are founded on the assumption that as theologians we are committed to what I should look on as a slavish literalism. I do not myself lay stress on the general accordance there seems to be between the account in Genesis and what we learn from science; and if there were less, it would be no particular difficulty to me.

Yours sincerely,

G. G. STOKES.

The Very Rev. the Dean of Peterborough.

Question 7. I do not see what else the "waters above the firmament" could naturally mean than the supply, whatever it may be, from which rain comes; and the commonest observation connects rain with clouds. Only a person who knew a little of science would think of invisible vapour as a source of supply.

P.S.—The above was written a considerable time ago. Since then Mr. Lockyer has put out a theory of the nature of nebulae, according to which they consist of vast swarms of meteorites, coming constantly in collision with one another, and by the heat of collision converting small portions of the matter of which they consist into incandescent gas. This theory is still under discussion, and cannot be said to have been either accepted or rejected by the scientific world. As regards what is written above, it signifies little or nothing which theory of the nature of nebulae we adopt.

Dec. 17th, 1890.

PROFESSOR PRITCHARD ON GENESIS.

I.

1. The present state of our *knowledge* indicates that the earth has cooled down after the lapse of unknown ages from a fluid or semi-fluid of intense temperature. This condition of things is without any further hypothesis as to a nebular origin.

2. If this be the case (as it *certainly* is), then at any period before the earth had cooled down to its present temperature, all *springs* would of necessity have been thermal to an extent inconsistent with the existence of any vegetation, such as we know it. Fruit trees could not have existed. This bears upon the assertion by Mr. Gladstone and others, that fruit trees existed before the sun cooled to its present normal condition.

Independently of this cooling of vegetation, unless the sun's actinism or radiation is direct, fruit (*i.e.* seed) could not have ripened.

Consistently with this gradual refrigeration of the earth "in the beginning," water as such could not have existed. Even steam would have been dissociated into hydrogen and oxygen, and possibly into *their* elements (if they exist). In this sense "darkness" could not conceivably have been over the face of the *deep*.

It is not conceivable, consistently with our knowledge, that WATER could have existed before the consolidation of the earth or the aggregation of the sun. Genesis i. 2 is not tenable in any natural sense of the words.

Ver. 3. Light is conceivable quite independently *of the sun*.

So that vers. 3, 4, 5 are not incredible on the score of their anteriority to the sun.

Ver. 6. Say what you will, the word "firmament" was by the ancients used to imply some sphere, however thin, in which a planet or the stars were whirled round the earth; and they did suppose that it rained through holes (windows) in this firmament, and it is the most obvious and natural interpretation to be put upon vers. 7 and 8. (*I have no doubt that such is the real meaning, and I do not see how this error could effect a sincere theology of an ancient seer.*)

Vers. 9, 10, 11, 12 are unobjectionable, excepting as to the time which was certainly expended during the operation, and excepting that it took place before God made two great lights.

Vers. 14-18 are unobjectionable, excepting in their asserted posteriority to the grass and the fruit trees.

Vers. 18-25 are objected to by paleontologists as inconsistent with known facts.

Thus the existence of water before the concentration of the sun into the form of a sun is inconceivable with a competent knowledge of the facts of nature. So too is the

existence of grass and fruit trees antecedent to the same, or even under the condition of the invisibility of the sun as a sun.

Genesis i. is therefore (if interpreted in a natural sense, and as intended to be a true description of the genesis of the earth and all that is thereon) not tenable.

It is inconceivable that such a description, intended to be a literally true description, could have been dictated by the Author of all truth to Moses in the mount.

I must now, in my utter weariness of the subject, refer you to my article in the *Guardian* for what I am convinced is an approximate solution of all difficulties; and the more so, the more I cogitate. But read carefully what I have said there and here. A *young child* I would teach Genesis as it stands in a natural sense. To an intelligent youth I should say: This is the tradition of an ancient vision, aided by God, for the purposes of teaching men, in the infancy of the world, that the God of the Hebrew fathers created the world, and all that therein is, in love and wisdom. The verses or visions are pictures of what God has done, not of the order, or the means by which He did it.

It is a Divine moral tale, not a scientific memoir.

PROFESSOR STOKES ON GENESIS. (2.)

II.

YOU wish me to make remarks on Dr. Pritchard's letter.

1. On the nebular hypothesis I think it more probable than not that the earth had cooled sufficiently for vegetation before the sun had condensed into a definite globe.

2. Vegetation demands light, but not necessarily *direct* sunshine. The coal flora shows large cryptogams, equiseta, ferns, etc.; and many kinds of ferns do better in shady places than in direct sunshine.

3. In the conjecture I threw out, I supposed "face of the

waters" was not to be taken literally. The language is such as would lead an uneducated and utterly unscientific mind to form some sort of an idea of a state of chaos, even though it were far from coming up to the reality. Such a person would not take in the idea of a *congeries* of discrete, as yet unassociated, atoms. Prior to any association, the whole would naturally be in a state of darkness. The expressions in ver. 2 would naturally convey to the mind an idea of perfect dissolution, which would be sufficient for all practical purposes, though the pictures formed in the mind of the reader might be very different from the reality.

4. I do not know what the ideas of the ancients were about rain; but surely in common observation rain and cloud are connected, and in a mountainous country you constantly see mountain tops which have been ascended to above clouds.

5. I think the greater light might very well not have assumed its present definite form till after vegetation had appeared upon the earth; and the lesser might well be maintained along with the greater, even though it was collected into a definite orb long before. 6, 7 already referred to. 8, 9, I do not think so.

In the main I agree with Dr. Pritchard. The theological difficulty turns on the adoption of what is equivalent to the theory of verbal inspiration. Are we to suppose that it was intended that a miracle should be wrought in the nineteenth century for the conviction of gainsayers? If so, then we might expect to find complete accordance even in detail discerned, as the book of science was opened out. But if we suppose that the record in Genesis was meant for the people of the time, and designed to give them ideas correct from a theological, or rather religious, point of view, then it would be preposterous to demand scientific accuracy of detail. A general rough accordance is all that we ought to expect; and that I think we have. We are not however

even *obliged* to suppose that the account was communicated by revelation to Moses. Genesis i. to ii. 3 and ii. 4 to ii. 25 may have been two traditions of creation. There is nothing in the account we have of what was revealed to Moses on the mount that relates to creation, except the allusion in the fourth commandment; and that might have been an allusion to an existing tradition, which was adopted as substantially correct for the purpose intended. It is not, I think, safe to attempt to make a nineteenth century miracle out of Genesis i.

The expression, "the windows of heaven were opened," in Genesis vii. 2, may well have been a poetical mode of describing a tremendous rain. It cannot, I think, be taken to *prove* that the readers of the book supposed that there was a reservoir with physical holes, through which the waters poured down in rain.

Yours sincerely,

G. G. STOKES.

The Very Rev. the Dean of Peterborough.

PROFESSOR PRITCHARD'S REPLY.

II.

I HAVE given much thought to Prof. Stokes's remarks.

He gives a philosophical account of what he, in common with the best-instructed physicists of this day, would give: it is the one commonly accepted now by the very few men competent to give an opinion thereon; that is, on the genesis of the material worlds, considered as apart from their living occupants. Virtually, it amounts to this:

1. Light existed before the consolidation of the earth.
2. The earth, he thinks, may have been consolidated before the concentration of solar matter into a sun.
3. He implies, also, and truly, that the moon was consolidated before the earth.

Prof. Stokes then goes on to say that *he is in utter dis-*

accord with any *literal* interpretation of the account in Genesis, but that he is himself satisfied with this account, and would be, even if it were more literally inexact.

In my opinion this way of looking at the question does not touch, but practically evades, the point at issue.

The real points are two.

I. Is Genesis i. *intended*, by means of Divine arrangement or interposition, to be a true description of the genesis of the earth and its inhabitants? If it be, then I for one am utterly unable to understand it as such, so long as I retain my reliance on certain knowledge and certain logic. I cannot understand how "water" could have existed before the consolidation of the earth. "The Spirit of God moved on the face of the waters." Neither can I understand how fruit trees and grass could have flourished before the concentration and visibility of the sun on the earth.

II. If Genesis i. was not derived through Divine aid as an intentional description of actual creative processes in their actual order, then I am myself driven to regard the account as probably the tradition of a series of visions vouchsafed to some ancient saint or seer, intended to represent the creation as the sole work of God, and not intended to describe either the order thereof or the *modus operandi*. Such visions I find were *the* (or at least *a*) method adopted for Divine communications to saints and prophets. (See what I have said in the *Guardian* of February 10th, 1886.)

P.S.—As regards the "firmament," I have no manner of doubt but that the writer of Genesis i. supposed, as men did suppose in ancient times, that there were crystallized spheres, or spherical shells, revolving round the earth, and holding up the planets and stars.¹ Through the nearest of these firmaments the upper waters poured down in rain.

C. P.

¹ But see my note on Gen. i. 6 in *THE EXPOSITOR* for November, 1890, p. 327.—J. J. S. P.

THE SELF-WITNESS OF THE SON OF GOD.

(JOHN VIII. 12-20.)

EVERY reader of the gospels is aware of a very striking change in the style of teaching adopted by our Lord when, leaving the common people of the rural villages, He came to confront the professional classes in the temple. His lessons become less simple and more abstract. He does not get leave to spread His discourse abroad in large masses, because He is perpetually interrupted at the outset, and forced to explain or to defend His words. The discourse becomes a discussion, almost a wrangle, in the end. From whatever point it starts, it soon turns upon Himself, the validity of His claims, or the credit to be attached to His testimony. In short, our Lord had to do at Jerusalem with men who had prejudged Him to be a "deceiver," and who therefore compelled Him to take up an apologetic attitude, a tone of self-justification. The rabbis and other officials of the nation were unquestionably entitled (in a sense) to sit in judgment upon His pretensions. It was their function and their business to investigate such claims as His, and to guide public opinion, so that their less instructed fellow countrymen might be enabled to discriminate betwixt the true prophet and the false, the genuine and the pseudo-Messiah. Before them therefore it was impossible for our Lord to decline the ungrateful task of self-defence. They sat in Moses' seat. They were the authorized "shepherds" of God's people. It lay with them to "judge righteous judgment." But then here was the hopelessness of the situation. Not only did they approach the subject with a prejudice or prejudgment, in their minds, which made them opponents and not judges; worse than that, they were, by their own carnal or unspiritual life, utterly disqualified from appreciating His spiritual teaching. They were like blind men pretending to

judge of colours. Themselves ungodly, out of sympathy with the Divine, and dead to the facts and laws of the unseen life, they lacked the very first qualification for understanding Jesus, or discerning how far His teaching was of God. He and they were like disputants between whom there is nothing in common, who think differently on the fundamentals of the argument; so that they really never meet each other's position, charge past one another (so to say) on different planes of thought, and fail to comprehend so much as one another's language. Two things resulted from this state of matters: the one, that our Lord in these word-tussles was always driven to fall back upon the unsupported testimony of His own consciousness to certain ultimate facts of spiritual experience; the other, that He never closed the debate without revealing the profound spiritual gulf which cleft Him asunder from them, a cleft which went down to the very roots of their nature, they being from beneath and He, as He averred, from above. It was the most remarkable illustration ever seen of the principle St. Paul lays down: "The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, for they are foolishness unto him; and he cannot know them, because they are (to be) spiritually judged. But he that is spiritual (*i.e.* in this case Jesus Himself) judgeth all things; and he himself is judged of no man."

These remarks may afford a key for the comprehension of the passage before us. The question discussed in it is this: Can the testimony of Jesus to His own claims be accepted?—a question which manifestly lies near the centre of all the religious controversies of our own day. It grew out of that magnificent utterance of His dealt with in my last paper;¹ the claim He put forth on the morning after the Festival of Tabernacles had closed to be the moral sunlight of humanity: "I am the light of the

¹ See THE EXPOSITOR, Fourth Series, vol. ii., p. 216.

world : he that followeth Me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life." These wonderful words were plainly adapted to form the text, or starting point, for a longer discourse. But possibly the brief and precious fragment preserved to us may have been all that was delivered. For He was interrupted by an objector, and a discussion ensued.

It was, of course, the interest of the adverse party to deaden the effect of His most impressive teaching, whenever they could do so, by some plausible cavil. In the present case, the objection was plausible enough. It raised the whole prior question, how far such an unsupported statement of our Lord could be taken as valid evidence in His own behalf. The Pharisees said to Him : "Thou art bearing witness to Thyself ; Thy witness is not true" : not reliable, not necessarily true and trustworthy. It is, of course, an admitted rule, that a man's testimony in his own interest, on any question of external fact where it is possible to verify it by independent witnesses, should not be received as sufficient. So far as the outward credentials of His Messiahship were concerned, Jesus had already, on a former occasion, admitted this. He had said (v. 31) : "If I bear witness of Myself, My witness is not true. It is Another that beareth witness of Me." But here the case was different. There are some things to which the man himself is the only competent witness to be had. A soul's spiritual history and spiritual condition cannot be made the subject of any external testimony. Of these facts in his interior life each man is alone cognisant ; and on these therefore his own evidence must be accepted, if you are to come to any conclusion on the matter at all. At first sight, it surprises one to find that our Lord reckons His position in the world as its moral light among such ultimate facts of His own consciousness to which He needs to bear witness. One expects such a fact rather to prove itself. Is

it not true that light of every sort must be its own evidence? It is there if you see it; if you do not, who will convince you of its existence? So it is with the light of the sun as an ultimate fact in physics, that proves itself to the sense of sight. So it is with the moral illumination which Christ affords. He whose soul has been lit up with the glory of God in the face of Jesus needs no other demonstration that He is from God. When we come into the region of such ultimate spiritual truth as Jesus teaches, proof in the sense of testimony or evidence, strictly speaking, fails us. As Chrysostom says: "God Himself is the only trustworthy witness to Himself"; and Christ, who is the image of God, vindicates His divineness no less to the open eye of the soul by simply being what He is. But then, to this self-evidencing power of Divine truth, the Pharisees were blind. They wanted the faculty to discern heaven's light; and the question was, Had Christ's witness to Himself any validity *for them*? Ought the blind to believe the Sun when He testifies of Himself, "I am the light of the world"?

To this our Lord's reply virtually is: His relation to the dark and sinful world of mankind as its appointed Light-bringer from heaven depends upon two facts: first, He is come from heaven; next, He is going back to heaven. For unless He is a messenger out of the unseen sent forth by God with a celestial mission to enlighten mankind, and a destination to return again to God when His task is done, He is no Saviour, Light-bringer, or Life-producer for our fallen race. Let that point be well considered. Superhuman origin, or the miracle of His birth; superhuman destination, or the miracle of His resurrection and ascension; lying between, a temporary career passed down here among the natural facts of earth, yet closely clasped and girdled in by these supernatural facts, even as this phenomenal world of ours is rounded with the dark un-

known of God: such is Jesus in His own esteem. This He needs to be, or He is nothing to us:—a Visitor out of undiscovered diviner worlds than ours, out of the very Light, returning back again from our eyes into the Light; yet leaving one broad and gladdening trail of glory athwart our dim and perilous road, by following which we need no more walk “in the darkness.”

Now, of these twin facts on which everything comes to hinge, who shall give us reliable assurance? “I do,” saith Jesus. “I know whence I came, and whither I go.” These are among the secrets of personal conscious experience of which no man can be a witness, save the Man Himself. The past fact—“I came forth from God,” as He elsewhere phrased it—was one which dwelt within this Man’s memory as an event experienced, of which He could not doubt. The future fact—“I am to go away back again to God”—stood present to His soul as a purpose, a destiny, to which His will was fastened as the necessary close of His mission. Whence He came, thither He must go: that also He could not doubt. Of these two unique and personal facts, none could be a witness but Himself. What could these Jews know of such things transcending observation? A Man they saw in the midst of them for a little: come from somewhere. By-and-by they saw Him no more: gone somewhither. But whence or whither they could not tell. He knew. “Though I do bear witness to Myself, My witness is valid; because I, alone, know whence I came and whither I go; but ye know not whence I came or whither I go.”

It is quite clear that our Lord means to claim a unique position among us, as a solitary witness at first hand to superhuman and super-earthly facts. He alone of all men does not confess to be bounded as to His knowledge by the limits of the five senses. He alone is conscious of a life antecedent to our human experience, a recollection which

travels back into some previous state of existence and up into another world than this. Of the superhuman, the celestial, the *other-worldly* facts and things, He talks to us, not like one who dreams, speculates, or believes, but as the solitary Witness who knows because He has seen. Is His testimony to be received? That is the question for our time, as it was for His own. Who of us is in a position to criticise, or to reject, His evidence? Is any other man justified in saying to this Man, "I never came, that I know of, out of any world above nature, never was there, never saw God or spiritual things; and therefore I cannot believe that You ever did. My five senses are all the organs which I possess for the acquisition of knowledge, and I recollect no life antecedent to my birth; therefore I cannot accept what *You* tell me of heavenly things, things not to be seen or heard or felt"? Is that reasonable? Is my ignorance a fair criterion for judging of Christ's knowledge? He says He is come into this world to shed light upon it from a higher one; am I entitled to say, "That cannot be, because I have no such light, and know nothing myself of any higher world"? Christ may be speaking truly or not; but at all events it is irrational and unfair to judge of His testimony by the analogy of other men. Till you have found another man as sane and honest as He, and therefore as credible, who will say in sober earnest, "I know whence I came; I came down from above, on a mission from the Father," you have no parallel among men to judge Christ by. The argument from ignorance is a very precarious one.

Yet this is precisely how many in our generation judge of Christ. They judge Him as the Jews did, "after the flesh." That is to say, they judge by what they can see, by the witness of their five senses. Jesus looks to the senses but a common man, the son of the carpenter Joseph, a remarkable specimen of piety and insight in one

of the working classes : and that is all we can see in Him. He professes to know more than other men ; but since it is certain that we have no means of information except scientific observation upon phenomena in nature, therefore it is inferred that He can have none either. His pretence to superhuman light on things Divine can be nothing but the frenzy of a heated brain. "He hath a demon, and is mad ; why hear ye Him ?" It is certainly interesting to find that Jesus encountered in His lifetime this estimate of His position now frequently met with among persons of superior culture, encountered it and answered it. What did He say ? He said : " You do not know whence I came and whither I go. You have no means of rebutting My evidence, therefore, nor any right to sit in judgment on it. You can only judge 'after the flesh,' by the unenlightened understanding of fallen human nature ; and the discoveries of One who has been with God and is come from God can be apprehended only by the spiritual nature after God has quickened it to discern and qualified it to judge."

Our Lord thus disputes the right of physical science to sit in judgment upon His spiritual teaching, or to controvert His personal testimony to spiritual facts. For He claims to have means of information at His command such as are not open to other men. On the strength of this He asks to be believed, even though His evidence were unsupported. But His evidence is not unsupported. It is by a very unexpected and striking turn of the conversation that He guides it to this fresh point. "Ye are judging Me," He had been saying, "after the flesh, misjudging My testimony therefore ; I for My part judge"—*you* (one expects Him to add), not after fleshly standards, but according to God or by the spirit, and therefore truly. Instead of that, He breaks the symmetry of His sentence to interject the unlooked for and stinging words, "I judge no

man." As if He had said: "Whereas you, with your blind, earthly eyes, are for ever presuming to sit in judgment on the claims of One come from above to give you heavenly light, I for My part, who might well expose and judge and condemn you, am come for more merciful ends, not to rebuke, but to illuminate and to save. I am come to show the way to God, and shed the light of love and hope on your dark path, and give you the blessedness of knowing Him whom to know is life eternal. Why meet a revelation so gracious in a spirit of carping and presumptuous criticism?" The rebuke is merited, and may well be laid to heart by the moderns who affect to judge of the Light of the world by the sparks of their own wisdom.

"Yet, if I do judge you," He goes on, "My judgment will not be mistaken like yours, misled by the outward appearances of things, but righteous and true; for I am never alone in it (that is, out of communion with Him who is alone the faithful and true Witness)—never left like you to Myself and the wandering fires of the godless and fallen understanding, but hold a perpetual interior fellowship with God My Father, and enjoy His ceaseless illumination. He lends to all My words infallible truthfulness and absolute validity." There is here a new, additional claim on our Lord's part to be a reliable Witness to Divine truth. Come from God, and about to return to God, He is not, even while on earth, separated from the invisible Father, so that the mists of the earth have power to confuse His insight or obscure His light. Throughout His entire experience and His witness-bearing there runs a mysterious doubleness—His soul abiding in union with the unseen Father whom He came to reveal. It follows that all He says or does is at the same time a saying and a doing of His Father who is in heaven.

Is there not almost a touch of holy sarcasm, a tinge of irony, in this condescension to the requirements of Hebrew

jurisprudence? "You refuse My witness," says He, "because it is unsupported. You would have the witness of two, not one, that you may have legal evidence for Divine facts, seeing that the Law says, 'At the mouth of two witnesses shall every word be established.' Have then what you want. Is not this enough? Are there not Two that bear witness, since I am one, and My Father, whose voice speaks through Me and on My behalf, He is a second, if you will?" It is a singular retort. He stretches Divine mysteries to fit them to our poor human necessities of thought, as far as they will bear stretching: that He may humour, as it were, the captiousness of the legal intellect, and leave His hearers without excuse. Alas! He humours them so far in vain. How is He answered? "Where is this Father of Thine who beareth witness with Thee?" Was it spoken in childish ignorance, as when Philip put the same question on a later day? Or was it an insinuation that it was an idle boast to appeal to such a Witness, who could not be produced in court for cross-examination at their bar? I do not know. But the question laid bare at all events the hidden source of their unbelief; to wit, their spiritual alienation from God, and consequent inability to discern spiritual truth. "Ye know neither Me nor My Father: if ye knew Me, ye would know My Father also."

Did I not say how every controversy betwixt Jesus and His learned critics was sure to run out into this at last—an exposure of their utter and profound inability to apprehend the spiritual or Divine? He lived and moved in one circle of being, they in another circle, outside of His. There is no path to the true knowledge of the Father but through an appreciative, trustful acquaintance with Jesus His Son. But no man can come in trust and love to the Son of God except the Father draw him. We are inclosed in a hopeless circle. Who can break through it? He only whose

grace changes the critic into the penitent. "Except a man be converted, and become as a little child, he cannot see the kingdom of God."

Is it not a sublime sight to behold this Son of the Most High, come to shine with saving light from heaven, yet meeting only denial from blind souls—kept at bay and set at naught by men whom, in their superior conceit, no tenderness on His part can soften, nor dignity overawe, yet able to retreat for strength in upon that innermost sacred consciousness of His essential oneness with the Father and His abiding fellowship in the Father's love? Like one who leans his back amidst all odds against some primeval rock, so does He abide in the power of His conscious divinity. From that nothing shakes Him. Believed or denied, His witness to Himself standeth fast. "I know whence I came. I know whither I am going. I know that I am not alone. Here am I, and the Father who sent Me."

J. OSWALD DYKES.

HOSEA.

IN my desire to cover the whole field of inquiry, I may explain that I cannot attend to form and polish and that sort of thing. I propose to strike various notes of thought and feeling that seem to me most interesting in our subject of study. I shall, first of all, make sure that you and I are thinking in the same way about the Hebrew prophets, when we talk about them.

A Hebrew prophet was not a sort of extraordinary magical oracle that was always telling people in a mystically wise kind of way little things that were going to happen, or predicting big things that were going to occur. The supreme end of a Hebrew prophet's action in predicting events was not so much to prove himself correct in having foreseen,

but rather to influence the people, to divert them from evil ways, to bring them back to the paths of goodness. And so there are a great many prophecies of coming evil in the Old Testament that have never been fulfilled, *e.g.* the prophecy of Jonah as to the destruction of Nineveh, because the people repented. There is a school of interpreters who think that a great deal of prophecy about the Holy Land and with reference to the Jews after the flesh still awaits fulfilment. These good people imagine that the inspiration of the Bible requires that every earthly prediction should have literal, earthly fulfilment. Their concern is, I think, quite unnecessary. A great many things that particular prophets expected to come to pass never did come to pass. Jonah cried, "In forty days Nineveh is to be destroyed," and was very much disgusted because it did not happen. Isaiah said to Hezekiah, "You have got to make your will, to set your house in order"; and yet God revokes that. There you have two concrete examples. The Divine purpose of the prophet's mission in the life and history of Israel was not to astonish people by anticipating the future: the reason of his existence was rather, as God's servant, to exert a practical, moral, religious influence on the people of his own time and his own generation.

I will add one other thing on this point. Undoubtedly those Hebrew prophets had a supernatural, Divine enlightenment given to them. With all my heart and soul I believe in the core and kernel of those great doctrines of supernatural revelation and supernatural inspiration; but, remember, God's supernatural is always natural, through and through. God did not use the prophets like speaking trumpets. He conveyed His inspirations—His Divine intuition and anticipation of what was going to happen, His own hidden mind and will, the secret energies working beneath history—He *conveyed* these, not merely through their vocal organs to their fellows, but through their minds,

through their own thinking, reasoning, struggling, in faith, hope, and endeavour, to see and to know God; *i.e.* through mind and heart and spirit, as well as through voice.

Therefore, in the whole calling of the prophets, and in the entire method through which they reached their knowledge and delivered it to the people, you must not think of them as being quite apart from us. Why, we have experience of the same kind in the work of conscience. We teach our children that conscience is the voice of God: and would to heaven we felt what we teach! It *is* teaching, if we do it. God speaks to you and to me as directly and as supernaturally as He spoke to those Old Testament prophets.

First, you have the real personal action of God in inspiring the prophets, and revealing His mind and will to them; and, secondly, you have it in their declaring and realizing that they received that Divine enlightenment, that supernatural enlightenment, in the most ordinary, simple, human, and natural ways and processes. In those facts you have a gain to evangelical truth; and there you and I may find lessons, examples, and inspirations for ourselves.

To get to know an Old Testament prophet, we want to find out what he was in his own day; what he said to his own people, what they understood him to say, what effect that had upon them; what aims and purposes he set before himself, as he spoke in public and forced his way into the councils of kings, and addressed great mob-meetings of his fellow subjects in the streets of Samaria or Jerusalem. What was the man actually, practically, driving at? what was he seeking to accomplish in his own age and among his own people?

Our subject is the prophet Hosea. I must show you the background against which stands out his figure, full of pathos and beauty, religious value and worth. Therefore I must sketch to you the region of the kingdom of Samaria:

the Northern kingdom, usually called the kingdom of Israel, in distinction from the kingdom of Judah. Palestine is a lofty tableland of broken hill-ridges, lying along the eastern end of the Mediterranean; away to the north are deserts, with fertile districts lying between, once occupied by various races, such as the Syrians and the Hittites. Away beyond, in the fertile valley of the Euphrates, lay the Assyrian empire; and away to the west and south the mighty Egyptian empire, in the rich plain made by another great river, the Nile. In the time of Hosea these were the two world-powers, the mighty empires, that controlled the Eastern and Western hemispheres.

Palestine lay like a bridge on the highway between those two great empires. Let me point out the political position occupied by it. It was, practically, precisely in the same unhappy position that Afghanistan holds in regard to India and the Russian advance through Central Asia. Those two empires, Assyria and Egypt, hate each other, and are competing with each other for the control of the world—for the mastery of the great highways of commerce, for the wealth of human industry. They must approach each other along that highway, in the midst of which lies Palestine.

You see therefore, that that little country, lying between these two empires, was exposed to the threatening danger of advance from opposite sides. Moreover, it became the very focus of plots on the part of those two contending powers; and just as in Afghanistan, so, constantly, it happened in Northern Israel, that you had two pretenders to the throne, one actually in power and the other his rival. The one in power holds his throne backed up by Assyria, while his rival is put up and supported by the great empire of Egypt. The consequence was ceaseless faction-fights and constant revolutions in the government in that Northern kingdom, very much the spectacle we lately witnessed in Afghanistan.

Going back to the period of the Judges, you remember how the confederated tribes—the Jewish tribes—took possession of Canaan, driving out, partially, the old inhabitants. One particular weakness that arose out of their tolerating the continued existence of the Canaanitish towns and colonies in their own land was this: The wedge of the Canaanitish towns ran right across the middle of the country possessed by the twelve tribes; between the ten Northern tribes and the two Southern ones, Benjamin and Judah. Moreover there was a natural break in the country, caused by specially wide valleys and passes. During the period of the Judges, power, authority, and dignity mostly lay to the north; Ephraim was the commanding tribe. One of the kings that came after the troubled reign of Saul, king of all the twelve tribes, was a man of the people—king David, whose dynasty was permanently established on the original Hebrew throne. During David's strong rule, the whole of the kingdom was held together, but not without difficulty. There were symptoms of revolt. During Solomon's reign, the unity of the kingdom was also maintained. But when his son Rehoboam was made king, insubordination broke out. There were two main causes, one civil and the other religious. First of all, Solomon had made great modifications in the local, communal method of government. He attempted to abolish the whole of the tribal districts, to form his kingdom into provinces, and to establish a government ruled by governors appointed by himself. It was a proper stroke of imperial policy. But it excited enmities; it had a tendency to centralization, and also to further reduce the power, influence, and dignity of the Northern tribes. Solomon likewise erected at Jerusalem a magnificent temple. Those were the two causes—religious and civil jealousies.

You remember the deputation that waited on king

Rehoboam, and the foolish answer he gave. Instead of going a long way to meet discontent and dissatisfaction, he took the high-handed course of coercion, and said : " My father made your yoke heavy, but I will add to your yoke ; my father chastised you with whips, but I will chastise you with scorpions." The result was that the ten Northern tribes revolted ; and Jeroboam was established as king.

All I can do is just to sketch to you the main character of the career of the Northern kingdom. It was exposed to rivalries, attacks from a number of small nations—Philistia, Phœnicia, Ammon, Moab, and especially Syria. It held its own with varying fortunes, sometimes successful, sometimes beaten, suffering a good deal in the constant wear and tear of those endless border forage wars. Its history was one of ceaseless vicissitude and disunion. The Southern kingdom always held together, more or less. It retained the family of David on the throne from its commencement to the end, over a period of four hundred years. But the wretched Northern kingdom changed its royal family seven times in the course of a period a little over two hundred years.

Then came a succession of assassinations and revolts. Indeed we know that the internal condition of the kingdom in those last years of its existence, in which it was crushed by Assyria, was something like a baker's oven when the fire has broken into it and is burning with fierce heat and flame all that the oven contains. The kingdom was rent by military adventurers sticking at nothing, the country was a scene of bloodshed and anarchy ; all ties of relationship and mutual loyalty and trust were broken up, and the fire was stirred from both sides, by Assyria to the north, and Egypt to the south-west.

That is a rough sketch of the history of the Northern kingdom. The period in which Hosea worked began near the termination of the long reign of the most statesmanlike

and warlike of Israel's kings, Jeroboam the Second. He was a man of great ability, of indomitable will. He knew how to organize all his resources; he conducted successful wars against the neighbouring rival nations. Moreover, he was favoured by the advance of Assyria from the north. Assyria began to attack the kingdom of Damascus, which had always been the most dangerous rival and opponent of Israel. Israel took advantage of that to recover its old ascendancy, to regain portions of territory of which it had been robbed. During the reign of Jeroboam, the Northern kingdom acquired great wealth and great fame, and a warlike spirit was developed. Religion, commerce, practically everything, flourished, except the actual well-being of the people; for a power built up by war is not naturally wholesome, is not founded on a stable basis. It may bring the appearance of great prosperity, wealth, and commerce, but it is purchased by the destruction of the foundation of national welfare; for all the wealth goes into the hands of the king and of the ruling classes. Instead of a great quantity of small freeholders, we find that the misery and the poverty of the slaves and serfs, the daily labourers in the towns and the peasantry in the country, was something horrible and pitiable.

It is a law of revelation that the great prophets always appeared at critical points in the national history. For instance, Elijah and Elisha appeared like two storm-birds presaging the troubled, bloody end of the great dynasty of Omri. In like fashion Hosea and Amos heralded the downfall of the great, imposing dynasty of Jehu. The actual ruin of Jehu's house did not take place for some time after. Ostensibly, to the end of king Jeroboam the Second's reign, Israel was prosperous. It took the Divine insight of the prophets of God, Hosea and Amos, to expose the ostentatious religion with its elaborate ritual, luxury, impurity, and idolatry—to understand that what looked like

a shining summer would end with nothing but the snows and frosts of utter desolation.

We gather that Hosea was a native of the Northern kingdom, and not a native of Judæa, as was his colleague Amos. It is just possible that he belonged to the aristocracy. Probably he was of priestly rank; at all events, he had a wonderful knowledge of Israel's past history. We see that Hosea was himself a citizen of the Northern kingdom when we compare his book with the book of Amos. Amos also writes, with an exact, vivid power of delineation, about wrongs and oppressions, about the political and religious position in the kingdom of Samaria. But here is the distinction. The words of Amos sound like a voice from outside, pealing with the thunder of God's anger and righteous indignation against wrongs and injuries that Amos does not feel himself bound up with. The characteristic of Hosea's book is that the burden of Israel's guilt lies weighty on his soul; he wails, and mourns, and laments, and repents with that sinful people. He cannot, without tears in his eyes, contemplate the glorious opportunities that have been flung away. He almost expresses a sense of his vicarious involvement in their guilt and carrying of their sorrows. That is the note which gives its exquisite music of pathos and beauty to Hosea's prophecy of the coming downfall of his own land and of his own people.

The characteristic idea, indeed the key-thought that underlies the whole of Hosea's prophetic message, is a very remarkable one. He pictures the relation between God and Israel as a marriage tie. It is of little use to try to divide the Book of Hosea into minute paragraphs and divisions, and to trace a line of thought through it, because, if there is any book in the Bible which is one long musical burst of emotional life and harmonious unity from beginning to end, it is the Book of Hosea. The man was not so

much an intellect ; he was a great, overflowing heart. He cannot think out things and reason out things. He sways like a pendulum from one extreme to another : now blazing indignation against the people's wickedness and blindness and madness, and the next moment lamenting over them like a mother over her only son.

Emotion is the characteristic of Hosea's writing. Thought, again, is the characteristic of the writing of Amos. And so far as thought goes, the key-doctrine of Amos is this : God is righteous sovereignty. The key-doctrine of Hosea is this : God is holy love.

The key-conception of Hosea's doctrine, Hosea's gospel, Hosea's prophecy is that the actual, real relation between God and Israel is best represented for his purpose by the tie between husband and wife. It is true that he varies that image near the end of his prophecy : there he pictures God as his father and Israel as his child, his son ; but still the great, moulding, explaining thought, throughout the whole book, is the marriage tie as a picture of the covenant between Jehovah and His people.

How did Hosea come to choose that as the image or metaphor of the relation of Jehovah to His people ? Very probably because it was an idea that lay in all the heathen religions round about : an idea that had corrupted the religion of Israel, for the gods Baal and Ashteroth predominantly represented the powers of nature, and especially the power of reproduction. That conception of a people being the offspring of their god and his spouse furnished to Hosea a basis on which to picture the tie between Jehovah and Israel. But, you say, when that idea had been so corrupted and defiled, how came it that Hosea did not discard it and choose a purer image ? The answer to that will come best when we see what use Hosea makes of the discarded and dishonoured image or conception.

Let us run over the essential points and thoughts in

Hosea's message. The first thing we have to pick out and fix in our minds in the message he delivered to his own age is the terrible picture he makes of Israel's utter moral ruin ; and, more than that, of Israel's physical, social, moral, political, and religious dissolution. Powerfully and passionately he scathes the oppression, the cruelty, and the selfish ambition that had impoverished and destroyed the conditions of happy and wholesome life for the mass of the people. Then he pillories the corruption of all justice, the taint of bribery that had ruined all the moral influence of every representative of law and government, priest-judge, and civil-judge. But what chiefly occupies Hosea is a loathing horror of the moral blight and stain that have appeared through the whole of the relationships of the people. The very sanctuary of Jehovah had attached to it a band of loathsome prostitutes, who served the temple in what were accounted acts of worship to Baal, the god of reproduction, and earned money to feed the greedy priests, and to aggrandise the external show and pomp of the sanctuary. When religion consecrated lust, that meant that all purity of family ties, all stainless virtue in the womanhood of the country, got its death.

The next thing Hosea strikes at is this—the utter loosening and dissolution of all law and order, and righteousness between man and man. The noble oppresses the peasant, the money-lender grinds with his cruel usury the poor victim he has got under his clutches, the corn-dealers band together to raise the price of bread in the starving towns, so that the poor are driven to desperation. Noble fights against noble, faction-fights fill the whole land, conspiracies destroy the foundations of the throne, the king is assassinated by his most trusted friends and followers and servants ; everywhere there is violence and rebellion, and all the ties and bonds that bind a nation together have been torn asunder.

Third, political ruin had fallen upon Israel. Placed there in that position of unsettlement, of exposure to the intrigues of two powerful empires, the people were driven on to ruin by the selfish schemes and disunion of their leaders and rulers, who did not comprehend that a nation's real welfare consists in virtue, in brotherhood, in justice, in mercy, in industry, in well-doing, in loving union of class with class, in the obedience of all to God above, in faith and heroic aspiration to work out a career on earth worthy of God that called them to be a nation. But Israel's leaders, Israel's rulers, were playing a mad, foolish game.

Those are the three great elements of Israel's corruption and of the ruin that had already established itself in the realm.

Now we come to the causes of Israel's downfall and degradation. The first cause Hosea points out for us in the shape of tremendous denunciation of Israel's prophets and Israel's priests. Strange that! It makes a man, by profession a preacher—a religious preacher—first tremble and then experience a great exaltation and inspiration. Hosea thinks that the most powerful force in a people resides, not in its wealth, not in its military might, not in its law or legislation, not even in its throne and government, but that the sovereign, dominating influence that makes or mars a nation resides in its moral and religious teachers. Whether they wield that influence by voice or by the pen—a nation's thinkers, morally and religiously, in the pulpit, in the press, on the platform, are a nation's heart. If that be diseased, woe betide the people! If the heart be kept sound, pumping and pulsating pure blood away through diseased parts and members of the body politic, there is hope, there is recovery, there is life, there is a future.

The second cause of Israel's utter corruption and ruin lay in the debasement and falsification of true religion.

The God Hosea knew was a great, spiritual God: a God whose whole being cared supremely for moral things, not for physical things; a God who meant this world to be only as a means to an end, to be the platform on which a human drama was to be played, a scaffolding within which a temple of eternal human character of goodness was to be built up, a kingdom of heaven on earth. Hosea's God longed for righteousness, justice, truth, mercy between man and man; for aspirations of unselfishness, of heavenliness in human hearts. Israel's God bore the same name as Hosea's God. Israel's God, worshipped at its shrine, was Jehovah—Jehovah, the old orthodox God of the nation. And Israel had not cancelled one of the old articles of its creed. Israel had not touched one of the laws that came down out of antiquity—laws stamped with the name and backed by the will of Jehovah. But Israel had utterly transformed the character of the God it worshipped. The God of Israel had sunk down to be a God of physical force, of sensual pleasures; a God of wine, revelry, lust; a God contaminated by everything materialistic, superstitious.

Hosea says the question is not what is the name of a nation's God, not what is the state-established religion, but what is the real religion, what is the real God, what is the real faith, the real aspiration, of a people?

What is the god of Great Britain now? Wealth. Wealth to be won by a merciless application of the laws of competition, and selfishness, and rivalry, and a so called political economy, at the sacrifice of thousands of human lives driven by the hard wheels of commerce and competition down into the mire and crushed out of human shape and form. The question is not, What is the God whose creed we recite in our churches? but, What is the God that dominates in our politics? What is the God that rules in our cities, and in our commerce? What is the God that is worshipped in our actual homes, in all our efforts to change

customs, to reach noble ends? Is it the God of justice, truth, mercy, human love, the God that is building a kingdom on earth? Or is it mammon? or is it human pride? or is it selfish advantage? Is it a God that will tolerate anarchy, and lawlessness, and hatred, and strife between class and class?

Hosea says the future of a nation hangs, not on the name of its God, nor on the creed of its worshippers, but on the actual God that is honoured, that is obeyed, that is worshipped.

Then, thirdly, Hosea declares that Israel's ruin is the ripe outcome of a total falseness in its very existence, its *raison d'être*, the fundamental principle of its being, its position as a state—defiant of God's will, thwarting the Divine designs.

Here is a strange thing. The Northern rebellion was divinely authorized. Prophets like Elijah and Elisha spoke not one word against the separate existence of the Northern kingdom; and now Hosea comes and says the existence of this Northern kingdom is a sin, out of which all other sin grows, and must end in ruin. There you have a splendid insight into the true nature of prophecy. Prophecy never made a declaration of absolute, infallible dicta of the perfect, complete will of God. Prophecy was opportunist. It spoke just the present truth, and it did not say, "An age hence this will not be true"; "that has been God's will all along." Prophecy always pointed to present duty.

Present duty is often the outcome of contending principles. An existent wrong may demand as its rightful remedy a thing wrong in itself. That was exactly the Divine justification of the first rebellion. It was an assertion of liberty against oppression. It was probably, to some extent, the assertion of the spiritual religion against the state-degraded religion that Rehoboam wanted to establish at Jerusalem. In any case, it had its justification in that it

was a protest against tyranny and despotism. The course that is justified by pre-existent evil nevertheless dare not become permanent, or else it will create worse evils. If, in the government of a country, you are forced to adopt such a course as coercion, your whole longing must be to get rid of it as soon as you can. Napoleon, you remember, said: "You can do anything with bayonets, except sit down on them." Governments must not sit down permanently on force.

Mark the difficulty of altering a course once entered upon. Note the awful power of an act or a decision to assert a separate existence for ourselves, when once taken, to escape from all control and to establish a force and an influence with our character that we never dreamt of. Take the case of a relation entered into with some one of a certain definite character. You fancied you would control and mould it. Ah! there it lives its own life; and moulds you.

Once that Northern kingdom was established with its throne, with its civil service, with its army, with its own shrines and places of worship—all of which had to be aggrandised, and emphasised, and backed up, to hold their own against the attraction of the centre at Jerusalem—with a priesthood, with hatreds and rivalries between the North and the South, how hard it was, in the teeth of all that, to always say, "We have rebelled; we have established a kingdom, but not permanently; the moment that we can re-unite with Judæa we must do it"! On the contrary, you had all these vested interests struggling to make the revolt permanent and unchangeable.

Hosea found in the original sin of the wilful, needless perpetuation of the rupture the root of all the original injuries. First of all, do you see how, once that rupture had taken place, once that Northern throne had been established by revolt and violence, there is a terrible ten-

dency in anarchy, in lawlessness, in violence, to breed and repeat themselves? As at Jezreel, bloodshed will avenge itself with bloodshed. I do not say that revolution is not sometimes necessary; but then, if a nation is wise, it will set its face determinately against a repetition of revolutions. Perhaps England has been wiser in that respect than other countries. It has had its revolutions, but it has not had a lot of them, like France. Once the rupture was made in religion, the terrible temptation that pressed upon the priests in the North to make their sanctuaries more attractive by rich and lavish luxuries had a tendency towards self-indulgence for its own pleasure and lust. Moreover, the Northern kingdom was more exposed to the contamination of such worship, because it felt bound to bid for favour and to please the people.

Last of all, there lay, like a demoralizing blight and chill at the heart of the Northern empire, the lack of some great, grand reason for its existence. It was a wrong of the South that had created it. That is a poor basis for a man to stand upon and protest. The South held to its grand belief that it had the true God, and God's chosen king. It held God's mandate to do God's will. But the Northern kingdom that protested against the wrong of the South, not able to believe it had the Divine charter, had slipped down into self-seeking selfishness and earthly aggrandisement. Here was no great, noble enthusiasm, no sense of a magnificent, single purpose and destiny in the world's history, to lift up its life, government, and religion. The kingdom inevitably sank down into a poor, an unprincipled, a selfish, a violent, a lawless condition.

Was there any hope of recovery? There was; and yet that hope lay like sunlight in the very heart of a night of darkest desolation and seeming despair. Hosea looked to renovation—moral, religious, national renovation. He looked to natural causes. He looked to poverty increasing

till it became intolerable. He looked to bloodshed and anarchy growing until they were insupportable. He looked to the utter dissolution of the nation's state. He looked to foreign conquest. He looked to exile in alien lands. He looked to natural processes of suffering and misery to produce a moral and a religious reform.

Do you know that is God's universal way? If you will read the world's history, you will find that famines, the growth of intolerable poverty in towns, the insupportableness of life among the peasantry, have been God's educative influences for waking the nations up to their proper career, moral, philanthropic, religious.

Hosea and Amos teach men to see in Assyria the mere tool in the hand of a just and an avenging God. Why, even the very ruin of the nation drives men not to despair, but to reverence of God. The mere awful fear of recognition of God as the God of retribution is not enough. There needs to come this second experience; when a long-continued, wilful, obdurate sinner has had the resistance of his pride broken down, there come to him regrets, strange pathetic visions of what he might have been, sudden perceptions of a Divine hand that reached out to him all along that pathway of folly, which, if he had only taken hold of it, must have lifted him up to honourable and noble achievements. He suddenly says: "This hand that strikes me with retributive ruin is the hand of One who loves me." All the past is filled with God, and then the present. Thus God in punishing is loving still—punishing therefore, not as vengeance, punishing as chastisement, punishing as educative discipline, punishing for restoration. Oh, the grandeur of that conception! A God that punishes His own loved child for sin must be such a holy God; who, when He strikes, hurts His own heart more than He hurts His own child; who does it to bring that child back to Himself and goodness. Oh the

love of the punishing, recovering God! Hosea's God is a God of holy love.

Now come back to Hosea's key-thought and image. God's relation to Israel is that of a husband to wife; not of master to purchased slave and harlot, but of husband to wife, bent on being wedded to His spouse in righteousness, in purity, in lovingkindness, in mercy, in virtue, in holiness. That conception of marriage so tender, so grieved, so forgiving, so clinging, how came Hosea to have that wondrous thought about God? It was something new. You find nothing like it in the Bible, before Hosea. That was the new revelation, the supernatural revelation to Hosea. How did God give it to him? Speak it to him mechanically? Ah, no! Divine revelations must be writ, not in type like printer's; it must be writ into the very sinew and web of the human heart and spirit, into a man's life. It is by experience God teaches man, by making man in His own image. Then a man sees and knows the image of God.

Go back to that story of Hosea's. As it is often told in a superficial, blundering way, it is something so paralysing that the majority of commentators have said it is mere allegory, and that Hosea only did it in symbolical action. The thing would be revolting in fact; it would be equally revolting in symbol or allegory. Moreover, how could it ever have an edifying effect upon a people ruined by sensuality and lust? It is a story of how God taught Hosea to understand God's heart, and so it was no allegory, no symbolical representation. It was a real experience. But comprehend what it was. For one thing, the very power of it depends on this, that Hosea's relation to the one unfaithful to him had at its very core and heart an exquisitely noble, genuine, true, human love. Hosea, a man of lofty character, grieved, broken-hearted for the sin of his own time, prayed to God, struggling to know God's will, and in the providence of God is led to fall into a pure, sworn,

noble love. He dreams of a bright, happy home with a woman to whom his heart goes out, whom he counts true, pure, and good, and lovely in return. He loves her, has children by her, learns to know what sweet human love is. Then a terrible disaster comes upon him: she proves unfaithful, and Hosea comprehends that this guilt that has struck his heart in his own house is but a bit of the great pervading pollution of his time. It is that degraded religion, that unfaithfulness to God, that declension of all purity in the land that has broken into his own family circle and has cut his heart till it bleeds. Oh, how the prophet's soul flamed with an unfeared-before indignation against the evils of his time, when, in God's providence, he felt them in the tenderest fibres of his being!

That was the beginning of God's revelation to Hosea, but not the end of it. Hosea was told how Israel had been unfaithful to God, and that made him comprehend God's loathing of Israel's sin. The fierce anger blazed out against her who had injured him; then in the desolation of his home after she had fled from him, the relentings, the agony, the old memories, the dreams that would come up, for the past could be recalled—in all that passing through Hosea's heart, he felt the echoes of the great heart of God; and then a thing almost beyond human nature happened to him. His heart grew so tender and so pitiful, that when he heard that his unfaithful spouse had been cast off by her paramour, had sunk into wretched poverty, had become a slave despised and ground down, the old love waked up within him; and he conceived a heroic deed of loyalty, forgiveness, and reclamation, almost supernatural, to go and love again, to buy her back out of her degradation and misery, which had made her repentant; not at once to restore the old ties—that might not be—but with infinite, wise lovingness to give her a chance to prove that she had returned to purity, to penitence, to affection.

W. G. ELMSLIE.

A SURVEY OF THE SYNOPTIC QUESTION.¹

I. RECENT LITERATURE.

THE last two or three years have seen an increased activity in the criticism of the Gospels in both its branches—as concerned with the Synoptic Gospels, and as concerned with the Gospel of St. John. We here in England may claim a certain share in this activity. We can point to at least one substantial work dealing with the Fourth Gospel (Archdeacon Watkins' *Bampton Lectures*); and on the Synoptics we have more than one which makes up for want of scale by freshness or intelligence of treatment. On the Continent several important works have appeared, not only by writers of established reputation coming back to a familiar theme, but also by others whose names are comparatively new in connexion with these subjects. Both in regard to the first three Gospels, and in regard to the Fourth Gospel, the present seems an appropriate time for taking a survey of the general position.

In attempting this, I propose to follow the usual division by taking the Synoptic group separately. I do this in spite of a protest from one of the writers whom I am just about to mention (Dr. P. Ewald). The protest was justified, and it is well that it should have been made. The division rests only to a limited extent on a real distinction in the nature of things. It is with this as with

¹ It is proposed to treat this subject in four papers under the following heads: (1) "Recent Literature"; (2) and (3) "Points Proved or Probable"; (4) "New Hypotheses." It is hoped that the series of papers on the Synoptic Gospels may be followed by a similar series on the Gospel of St. John.

so many other subjects, in which something is perforce lost by separating what ought to go together. But if we do not forget the cross-relations which are woven backwards and forwards between this half of the subject and that, if we keep reminding ourselves that the division is primarily one of convenience, then I do not think that it will lead us very far wrong. Convenient at least it is to break up our subject in this way, especially as the present position of things at which I am looking suggests in each case a different leading idea and a different mode of treatment.

I place therefore the Synoptic Gospels first; and I begin by a roll-call of the works of which I shall have to speak. They are as follows :

The Rev. J. Estlin Carpenter: *The Synoptic Gospels* (full title, *The First Three Gospels: Their Origin and Relations*). (London, 1890.)

The Rev. A. Wright: *The Composition of the Four Gospels*. (London and New York, 1890.)

Professor J. T. Marshall: article in THE EXPOSITOR for July, 1890, entitled, "Did St. Paul use a Semitic Gospel?"

Dr. P. Ewald: *Das Hauptproblem der Evangelienfrage und der Weg zu seiner Lösung*. (Leipzig, 1890.)

Dr. A. Resch: *Agrapha (Aussercanonische Evangelienfragmente)*, being Band v. of Gebhardt and Harnack's "Texte und Untersuchungen." (Leipzig, 1889.)¹

¹ Since the above list was in type there has come into my hands another important monograph on the "Quotations from the Gospels in Justin Martyr in their Bearing upon the Criticism of the Gospels" (*Die Evangelienzitate Justins des Märtyrers in ihrem Wert für die Evangelienkritik*), by Wilhelm Bousset (Göttingen, 1891). The inclusion of this work would only tend to strengthen the position taken up in the essay. The author, who writes with conspicuous independence and freedom from apologetic tendency, expressly states his adhesion to the Two-Document Hypothesis; and he comes in part, at least, to the same result as Dr. Resch. He believes that, besides our present Gospels, Justin had direct access to one of the original documents out of which those Gospels were constructed.

I do not include in this list the Rev. J. J. Halcombe's *Historic Relation of the Gospels* (London, 1889), because if it were treated at all, it would have to be treated separately; and because, in spite of many scholarly qualities, it seems to me to pursue a line of argument which can only end in disappointment.

A few words of introductory characterization will prepare us to consider more closely the argument of the books before us. It fell to me to speak of Mr. Estlin Carpenter's volume in *THE EXPOSITOR* for last month. His sketch of the results of Synoptic criticism is based upon an intelligent estimate of English and Continental opinion, not without some first-hand study. In Mr. Wright's little book there was of necessity more of the latter than of the former, as it was written at sea, with no other help than that of the *Synopticon* and Westcott and Hort's *Greek Testament*. At the same time acknowledgments are made to Dr. E. A. Abbott, Dr. Bernhard Weiss, and the two Cambridge Bishops of Durham. More will be said about Mr. Wright's theory in subsequent papers, but in the meantime recognition is due to this vigorous attempt to realize and reproduce the circumstances under which the Gospels were actually composed. The author has certainly written "with his eye upon the object." What he gives us is no mere repetition of other people's views, but a conception, freshly and strongly formed, of his own. It has the good fault of erring on the side of definiteness. Sometimes the effect of this is rather quaint. Mr. Wright knows the ins and outs of his friends the catechists' proceedings more intimately than most of us. Here, for instance, is a passage:

"Clement of Alexandria tells us that S. Matthew was a vegetarian, like S. James, the Lord's brother. This fact may have increased his hold on the esteem of the Church at Jerusalem. But his apostolical office must have brought him to the front after S. Peter's withdrawal. And thus he may, not only have continued to give his own new lessons, but he may well have exercised a general superintendence over the

catechists, and perhaps assisted them in the important work of piecing the two cycles together to form one compact course of instruction for practical use; for the second cycle appears never to have been written down separately, or to have formed a perfect work by itself.

“When the task was but half completed, there came the demand for catechists to teach in those Gentile Churches which S. Paul was founding; for S. Mark had turned back from the work, and others must be had to take his place. Such teachers might no doubt have been obtained at Antioch; but it is evident that S. Paul drew his main supply of evangelists and catechists from the energetic, proselytizing Church at Jerusalem, or his converts would not so soon have been tinged with Judaism. [?]”

“These missionary catechists took with them the course of instruction then current. That is to say, they took the first cycle [*i.e.*, in Mr. Wright’s view, the teaching of S. Peter], in a form by no means so much curtailed as it afterwards became in the East. And intermingled with it they took such parts of the second cycle [the teaching of S. Matthew] as had been completed. Thus the later portions of the second cycle, except a few fragments carried from time to time by occasional visitors, never reached the West, and accordingly cannot be found in St. Luke’s Gospel. For communication between the East and the West was not encouraged in later time, S. Paul preferring to educate local catechists for his own use, rather than run the risk of occasionally introducing a ‘false brother.’” [?]¹

We may remark in passing, that Mr. Wright’s whole theory is the nearest English counterpart to that put forward in Germany by Wetzel, of which some account was given by Dr. Edersheim in the first volume of *Studia Biblica*. The central feature of both is the systematic lecturing which they assume—systematic at least in its machinery, if not exactly in the course of instruction given. I cannot but think that both writers postulate too much under this head. Although it is true that some catechists probably did give instruction in the facts of the life of Christ, they had much else to occupy them: the fulfilment of prophecy and proofs from the Old Testament; simple moral teaching like that of the “Two Ways,” or first part of the *Didaché*; practical directions for the life and worship of

¹ *Composition of the Gospels*, p. 62 f.

Christian communities, such as are found in the latter part of that treatise. Least of all can I suppose that there was any deliberate training—almost a college, with St. Peter or St. Matthew at its head—for sending out relays of qualified instructors, as both writers seem to suppose. Other difficulties in Mr. Wright's scheme I shall have to mention later; but my principal object was to call attention to the realism of his descriptions, the earnestness with which he has thrown himself into his own theory, and worked it out in concrete detail; in a word, what the Germans would call *Pragmatismus* by which his book is characterized.

Readers of THE EXPOSITOR will still have fresh in their memory Professor Marshall's paper which was placed third on our list.¹ Unhappily the present writer, whose acquaintance with theology dates back from a time when there were no honour schools or triposes in that subject, has "wisdom at one entrance quite shut out" in regard to it by his ignorance of Hebrew. So far as one can judge who is thus disqualified, he would say that the value of Professor Marshall's paper is not at all to be measured by its brevity. The points selected for treatment, though few, are striking, and appear to be deserving of close attention. In order fully to appreciate this paper, it needs to be set in its place, as we shall shortly attempt to set it, among other recent investigations. The author himself hardly appears to be conscious of the many points of contact which his argument has with these—more particularly with the elaborate and learned work of Dr. Resch. This work, which is styled by its author *Agrapha*, is primarily a collection of sayings of our Lord which are supposed to have been quoted from

¹ It will be understood that, when this was penned, I was not aware that Mr. Marshall was projecting the further series of papers begun in the last number of THE EXPOSITOR. It is also hardly necessary to say that the coincidence between the end of this essay and the first of Mr. Marshall's is wholly undesigned. Our paths will diverge more in later numbers, though we may perhaps have the opportunity for a little mutual criticism.

lost—not apocryphal—Gospels. But it is also a first instalment of what is practically a new and independent theory of the origin of the Gospels. This we shall have presently to state and examine. In the meantime it may suffice to say that if there are features in the theory which one is tempted at first sight to put aside as too unpromising for discussion, one is precluded from doing this by the accumulated marks of genuine first-hand work which the book exhibits. Dr. Resch tells us that the publications which he is now beginning are the fruit of five and twenty years of labour; and it is obvious that work so thorough and so coherent cannot lightly be disregarded.

Dr. Resch writes with the enthusiasm, and with something of the sanguine temper, of a discoverer. In this he resembles—though with a certain difference—the other German writer whom I have named along with him. Dr. Paul Ewald—not to be identified with the palæographer of the same name, who was associated with the late Gustav Loewe in editing a well-known volume of facsimiles of Visigothic MSS.—is, I believe, a young professor who has recently entered upon his office at Leipzig. His inaugural lecture, delivered in 1887, was published last year, but-tressed round by excursuses amounting to six times its bulk, under the title *Das Hauptproblem der Evangelienfrage*. The “main problem” which Dr. Ewald sets himself to solve is, how to account for the differences between the first three Gospels and the Fourth. Dr. Ewald will not do this by the easy method often had recourse to of simply throwing overboard the latter. On the contrary, he asserts and defends the genuineness of the Fourth Gospel, and he turns round the question, and points it in a direction which is really the opposite to that which it usually takes. Assuming the substantial truth of the Johannean tradition, he asks himself how to account for the apparent absence of so much of it from the Synoptics. In the course of this inquiry he is led

to state his views on the origin and composition of these Gospels; so that on both sides we shall meet him, at once in our present sketch of the position of Synoptic criticism, and also later when we come to speak of St. John. Dr. Ewald too is a writer who will have decidedly to be reckoned with. He is another of the vigorous workers whom Germany produces in such numbers. And if there is something of youth in the emphasis with which he writes, which might perhaps bear toning down with advantage, it springs at least from the consciousness of thorough study and the strength of honest conviction.

In the literature which I have been describing there is more than one coincidence which seems to me to point to the opening—perhaps only for a time—of what may be called a new phase in the criticism of the Synoptic Gospels. Hypotheses are put forward in such a way as to demand a hearing, which a few years ago would have been thought altogether too paradoxical. We shall have to take up and consider these hypotheses before we have done. But the opportunity may perhaps first be taken to cast a glance backwards as well as forwards, to adjust our bearings in reference to the past, before we decide how our helm is to point in the future. Do the works of which I have been speaking indicate any progress? Is there any solid advance to be recorded apart from the mere ebb and flow of opinion?

The solution of all great critical problems moves slowly. There seems to be an immense expenditure of labour for little positive result. For years, nay, for generations together, there will seem to be only a wilderness of mutually contradictory theories. It is only after a long and painful struggle, in which advance and retrogression will seem to succeed each other, that the tangle is thinned, a clearing effected here and there, and that roads begin to be driven through the thicket which will be extended until they meet

in the end. The moral is, that a sound argument cannot be drawn from these differences, especially in the early stages of an inquiry. Differences, contradictions, hypotheses even diametrically opposed to each other, are what, in the nature of things, we must expect. We may be sure that they will not last for ever. Even a negative result is a result. To disprove the false is a real step towards the establishment of the true. By degrees the confusion becomes less, and order is introduced—at first it may be in some quite outlying section, disconnected as it seems from the rest. But order in one section is soon followed by order in another; and the rate of progress is gradually accelerated.

Of course opinions will differ as to the outlook of any one subject at any given time. And yet there is reason to think that a number of biblical problems are nearing the stage when a glimmer of daylight begins to show itself among them. The daylight may still be very partial; it may be only a faint streak along the horizon; the clouds may come up again and cover it: and yet it *is* daylight, the harbinger of morning and of day.

Among the problems which are thus trembling on the verge of discovery—not of final and complete discovery, which no doubt may still be long in coming, but of the first beginnings of a real solution,—I believe that we may count this Synoptic problem as one. We cannot wonder at the delay; for I doubt if in the whole range of literature there is another question which involves data so complicated, so minute, and to all appearance so conflicting. To find the hidden unity which shall reconcile these is indeed a difficult task.

Practically we may say that the Synoptic problem has been before the world in its modern form for about a hundred years. If we look back over those hundred years we shall see a number of landmarks mapping out the course

which it has taken. The starting-point is Eichhorn's theory of a *Protevangelium* (1794), essentially right in its assumption of a common original source for our three Gospels, though wrong in its artificial construction of intermediate steps between the original Gospels and the Gospels as we have them. At the opposite pole to Eichhorn would be Schleiermacher's theory of *Diegeses* (1817), according to which the earliest stage in the history of the Gospels was not marked by any single document, but by aggregates of floating narrative, which by degrees were combined into larger wholes. Among these hypothetical aggregates, that which has established itself most permanently is the "Collection of Discourses" by St. Matthew, which Schleiermacher elicited from the evidence of Papias (1832). In strict order of time (1789-90), anterior both to Eichhorn and Schleiermacher, was Griesbach's enforcement of the view, which made our St. Mark an epitome not only (as St. Augustine held) of St. Matthew, but of the two companion Gospels. This theory exercised an important influence over subsequent speculations, determining amongst others the order assigned to the Gospels by Baur, although it has been, I think, rightly remarked, that this alone of all the theories on the subject, not only is not true in itself, but does not even contain an element of truth. In 1818 Gieseler put forward another theory, deriving our Gospels, not from any common document, but from a common base in oral tradition, in which he too has had a long line of followers, and which is even yet most in favour in some conservative quarters. For twenty years the factors so far assumed were combined by different writers in different proportions, more attention being given to the statements of Papias. The most noticeable event is then the reaction in favour of St. Mark as against Griesbach's hypothesis, at the head of which might be placed the works of Weisse and Wilke, both of which appeared in the same year (1838).

We are thus brought to the Tübingen period of Baur, Zeller, and Schwegler, the characteristics of which are well known. The path of literary criticism was now deserted, and the peculiar relations between the Gospels were explained as due rather to the theological leanings (*tendenz*) of the writers. Foremost among the opponents of Baur was Ewald (1849); but the next larger period is best dated from the close and searching work of Holtzmann (*Die Synoptischen Evangelien*, 1863). Holtzmann decisively brought back the debate into the channel of literary criticism from which Baur had disturbed it, though the considerations on which Baur laid, as we can now see exaggerated, stress can never again be lost sight of. From 1863 onwards the methods of inquiry have not noticeably altered; for heirs to the Tübingen tradition like Hilgenfeld and Keim largely modified their views in this direction, and the return to a more extreme position by Holsten (in *Die drei ursprünglichen noch ungeschriebenen Evangelien*, 1883) met with little approval and no imitators. On the other hand, a number of very solid works, conspicuous among which I would name those by Weiss and Wendt, are constructed upon lines which do not diverge widely from Holtzmann.¹ At the same time Holtzmann has made a number of concessions which have brought him nearer to his fellow workers in the subject.²

At the end of this chain of evolution come the five works which I have named above. One of them, Professor Marshall's essay, makes no direct statement on the wider question of the origin of the Gospels. The single allusion which he makes to this, dating St. Luke's Gospel from the imprisonment of St. Paul at Cæsarea, in the years 58-60, is an opinion which I cannot believe to be tenable.³ The

¹ Weiss, *Das Marcus-Evangelium*, 1872; *Das Matthäus-Evangelium und seine Lucas-parallelen*, 1876; *Einleitung*, 1886. Wendt, *Die Lehre Jesu*, 1886.

² See his *Einleitung*, p. 339, first edition, 1885.

³ Mr. Halcombe goes a step further than Professor Marshall: he thinks that

other books all imply some form of the Synoptic theory; and it is a satisfaction to find that they all imply substantially the same. The common postulate of Mr. Carpenter and Mr. Wright in England, and of Dr. Ewald and Dr. Resch in Germany, is what is usually called the Two-Document Hypothesis; *viz.* the hypothesis that at the root of our three Synoptics there lie two main documents, a narrative by St. Mark composed from the preaching of St. Peter, and a collection of our Lord's discourses first put together by St. Matthew. It will be seen at once—and it is no small argument in support of the theory—that it is just two such documents as these to the existence of which Papias, in the first quarter of the second century, bears express testimony. It is now generally agreed that it would not be safe to base a theory of the origin of the Synoptics on Papias alone: but the investigations of which we have been speaking have all been conducted independently of Papias, and all conducted also independently of each other; so that when they are found to converge towards a conclusion with which the language of Papias is so easily reconcilable, the coincidence must needs carry great weight with it.

At the present moment there can be little doubt that this Two-Document Hypothesis holds the field. It is however a complex hypothesis, consisting of a number of parts which do not all stand upon the same footing; and in the next paper I shall do my best to distinguish between them, and estimate what appear to be the several degrees of probability attaching to them, so as in some measure to define those lines of investigation on which most has been already done, and also those on which most remains to do.

W. SANDAY.

St. John's Gospel was written first, and St. Luke's last, and that *all four Gospels* "must have been in general circulation before the Acts of the Apostles," *i.e.* before the year 62 or 63. (*Historic Relation, etc.*, p. 235).

THE MINISTRY OF LIGHT.

(2 COR. IV. 1-6.)

THE historical situation may be briefly described. The Apostle had founded the Church at Corinth, and had watched over its growth with a father's anxious and loving care. He found that many troubles had arisen, and many disorders had crept in among them. He had already written them one Epistle. When he learned from Timothy and Titus what was the effect of his first Epistle, he writes again to deepen the impression made, and to remove from the minds of the Corinthian people certain prejudices and misconceptions they had formed regarding him and his ministry. He intended to visit them again. In order that his visit might be for their edification, he must by all means get them into a frame of mind which would enable them to receive him and his ministrations loyally and gladly. He must therefore vindicate his apostolic authority. He has a right to be heard; he has authority to reprove, rebuke, and exhort, for he is an Apostle of Jesus Christ. His apostolic authority had been vehemently denied by many; and he must, not as a personal matter, but in the interests of the Gospel, vindicate his authority.

A main part of the vindication of his apostleship consists in a description of the character of the ministry he has exercised among them. He is willing to test it by its nature and results. Let the Corinthian Church do so, and he will abide by their decision. The section of the Epistle which we are now to consider sets forth one aspect of the ministry of the Gospel, and on this Paul lays stress for the vindication of his claim to the apostleship. True, he does not depend on this plea alone. He knows that he is an Apostle, that he is sent by the Lord Jesus Christ to be an ambassador to the nations. He has received the ministry;

he has not run without being sent. But he is content to waive all other proof for the time, and to appeal to the Corinthian Church on the ground of his personal character and the character of the ministry he had exercised among them. "Our glorying is this, the testimony of our conscience, that in holiness and sincerity of God, not in fleshly wisdom but in the grace of God, we behaved ourselves in the world, and more abundantly to you-ward" (2 Cor. i. 12). His appeal is not only to personal character and motive, but also to results which any one could verify. "Thanks be unto God, which always leadeth us in triumph in Christ, and maketh manifest through us the savour of His knowledge in every place" (2 Cor. ii. 14). Nay, the Corinthians themselves are the sufficient and abiding proof of his ministry. They are "an epistle of Christ." They show that Paul is an able minister of the New Testament.

In various ways, and from different points of view, he sets forth the character of the ministry he has received. It is "the ministration of the Spirit," "the ministration of righteousness." It is a ministration of freedom, and of glory, and those who receive this ministry, those who exercise it, and those for whom it is exercised, "are transformed into the same image from glory to glory, even as from the Lord the Spirit" (iii. 18). At this point begins the passage we seek to study more fully.

The possession and the exercise of such a ministry imply certain effects on the character of the Apostle. He cannot be a true minister, if he does not exclude from motive and action every unworthy aim and purpose. For this ministry has begun in mercy. He has not won it for himself, nor obtained the vocation of a minister by any merit of his own. So he writes, "even as we have obtained mercy." He acknowledges his helplessness; he knows that he cannot preach, nor do any good to himself or others, except in so far as God has had compassion on him. When he thinks of

the ministry, and of the pains and sorrows, as well as of the grace and glory, of it, the Apostle ever returns to this thought, that he had obtained mercy, that God had had compassion on him. "Howbeit I obtained mercy," he says in the First Epistle to Timothy. It is the undertone of all his thinking, and to this thought he ever returns. He must continue to fulfil the ministry he has received, since both the beginning and the continuance of it are signal instances of the mercy of God.

He finds himself in the possession of "this ministry." He has not "taken the honour to himself," nor can he lay it down when he pleases. It is the work of God, and Paul must serve while life and strength endure. The manner of service is also determined for him. As Bengel says: "*Misericordia Dei, per quam ministerium accipitur facit strenuos et sinceros.*" The Apostle cannot faint or fail, nor suffer himself to be discouraged. True, he may have to ask, "Who is sufficient for these things?" If so, it is only to answer, "We are not as the many, corrupting the word of God: but as of sincerity, but as of God, in the sight of God, speak we in Christ" (ii. 17). Dangers and difficulties may meet him, he may be spoken against and maligned, his Gospel may be veiled, and his ministry seem to fail; but because he has obtained mercy he does not faint nor fail. The mercy of God has found him, and made him simple, strong, sincere.

The service in which he stands limits him also in the use of means. Certain means he must renounce. There are ways of action he cannot use. He cannot do evil that good may come. Not even in the interests of the Gospel can he do aught contrary to the spirit of the Gospel. "We have renounced the hidden things of shame, not walking in craftiness, nor handling the word of God deceitfully" (iv. 2). He proceeds from the general to the particular. He will not yield to the impulse of shame, nor seek to hide

what the sense of shame prompts him to conceal. The ministry must be honest and open and true. It must neither extenuate nor exaggerate, nor yield in any way to the suggestions of a mere sense of honour. These are weapons of the flesh, which the Apostle cannot wield. Nor can he walk in craftiness, that is, he must not use crafty means to gain his ends; and he must use the word of God fairly and rightly, according to its meaning and purpose.

These are the negative conditions of the ministry of the word of God, conditions which every ministry is bound to fulfil. As we look at them, and ponder over their wide significance, we are reminded of the statements made by eminent men of science with regard to the scientific love of truth for its own sake. They tell us of the severe conditions under which men of science must serve if they are to be true to their calling. Some of them indeed speak as if they alone had a scientific conscience, and had a monopoly of that spirit which looks at truth and fact objectively, and with supreme disregard of all other considerations. But the scientific regard to truth is manifested in regal splendour by the Apostle in this great passage, as indeed it is throughout his writings. We need not carry the war into the enemy's country, nor inquire how far scientific men live up to the height of their great calling. Let us accept their teaching, and disregard their practice when inconsistent with it. However high and pure their teaching with regard to the purity of truth may be, we had not to wait in order to learn it from them. Here we have it in living, concrete form, ruling the practice of a man who lived and acted according to its behests many centuries ago; and to him we would do well to listen. He will tell us that there are many ways in which we may not walk, and many means we may not use. Whatsoever kind of ministry we may have in the Church of Christ, whether we have to speak to popular audiences, in the full glare of public life, or whether

our work is in the study, in all cases we have to renounce the hidden things of shame, put craftiness away, and handle the word of God fairly and honestly. We must not bring prejudice to exposition, nor permit tradition to draw a veil over the word of God. We must follow the truth wheresoever it may lead us, let the consequences be what they may : such are the teaching and practice of the Apostle.

On the positive side he is equally precise. He desires to commend himself to the people of Corinth, but he will not, as the antagonistic teachers did, use letters of commendation, or descend to intrigue, or adulterate the word of God, to win their honour and love. He has one, only one, way of commending himself. "By the manifestation of the truth commending ourselves to every man's conscience in the sight of God." These are the only legitimate means for him ; all others are excluded by the very nature of his ministry. He has received the truth, and the truth he must make manifest ; and by truth he means the whole contents of the Gospel of Christ. His mission is to make the truth contained in the Gospel known to all. The truth thus made manifest is of itself sufficient to commend the preacher to the people. He needs no other commendation, and ought not to seek any other. The limits he prescribes to himself are a source of strength to him, for they enable him to go straight to his object ; and his object is to win men for the truth and by the truth. But a further limitation meets us as we advance. It is not all kinds of Gospel truth, nor all ways of presenting it, that the Apostle means. It is such truth and such a way of presenting truth as directly appeals to the conscience. The aim is practical, and is meant to influence conduct ; and therefore the truth of the Gospel is presented by the Apostle in such a way as to move the conscience and stir to action.

It may indeed be said that all kinds of truth have their value, and all appeal to the conscience. It is also true that

every truth tests a man, and declares of what sort he is. By the reception he gives to any discovery of a truth in science newly set forth, a man shows whether he has a free, open, receptive mind, or a mind given over to prejudice and preconception. His reception of a truth varies in inverse proportion to the number of prejudices it has to overcome. The greater the number of prejudices it has to overcome the less welcome it is. The truth of the Gospel however disturbs more prejudices, sets in motion a greater number of dislikes, and cuts athwart a greater number of human tendencies, than is the case with truths in science, philosophy, or ethics. It is also of more transcendental importance than any other truth. The manifestation of it tries and tests a man in the most terrible way. By the acceptance of the truth he shows his sincerity and honesty, his nobility of mind and cleanness of conscience, as by the rejection of it he shows that he has no interest in the truth as such.

The Apostle assumes however, that the manifestation of the truth of the Gospel must have its effect on the conscience of every man, just as he assumes that every man has a conscience. Every man has the faculty of moral judgment, and to this faculty in particular the Apostle appeals. If the conscience were aroused, if he could overcome and remove the perversion or the stubbornness of the moral judgment, if he could make the truth manifest to them in such a way as to accomplish this, then his work would almost be done. But whether this was the result or not, it was always his aim. He will manifest the truth, and do this as in the presence of God ; and if the conscience of men remain irresponsive, the Apostle cannot help it. He has done what he could. What can the cause of failure be? It does not lie in the truth, nor in the presentation of the truth by the Apostle. The success of the Gospel in other places, and among the Corinthians themselves, proves that

this is not the reason. Nor does failure arise from the absence of conscience in man. Man has a conscience, to which the truth may come and on which it may act. What then is the hindrance? Why has the truth failed? and why has the conscience remained stubborn and refractory? Not from the nature of the truth, nor from the nature of the conscience, but from the fact that in the case of some these two do never get into contact. There is an affinity between the truth of the Gospel and the conscience; and the contention of the Apostle is, that as soon as truth and conscience fairly meet, their relationship and correspondence are at once demonstrated. The conscience is quickened and enlightened by contact with the truth.

He has however to consider the nature and cause of failure. "But if even it is the case that our Gospel is veiled, it is veiled in them that are perishing." He states a fact, and gives an explanation of it. Failure is so far admitted. The Gospel has not reached the hearts and consciences of some people. Why? Because there is a veil between. The Apostle finds some difficulty in saying what he precisely means. In answer to the objection that the truth has not commended itself to the conscience of every man, he has to assume that the Gospel is veiled. But the assumption is made only for the moment. He immediately proceeds to show that the veil is not on the Gospel, which, like the sun, is always shining, but is on the heart of the "perishing." The truth has been manifested to them, the Gospel has been shining on them, and they have been unable to see it. This does not invalidate the truth or the power of the Gospel; on the contrary, it only serves to show that there are people who are perishing. Inability to see the truth is a proof of the perilous condition in which they are.

Such, says the Apostle, is the fact. He next proceeds to give the explanation. He had in the former section to

deal with the unbelief of the Jews, and to explain why the veil lay on the heart of the Jews "whenever Moses is read." But the same explanation does not serve here. For the light of the Gospel is so much clearer, brighter, more glorious than the light of the former dispensation, that it ought to have pierced through the veil, and to have reached the conscience. Mere prejudice, or any habit or cause which has its origin in human life alone, will not account for the dense resistance to, and stubborn ignoring of, the truth. It has a deeper origin. The veil is manufactured elsewhere. Its dense folds, which no ray of light can pierce, betray its author. The Apostle does not hesitate; he traces the authorship of the veil to one whose proper work it is. The veil is in them that are perishing; but they are perishing because the god of this world is working in their hearts. "In whom the god of this world hath blinded the minds of the unbelieving." *ἐν οἷς* describes to us the secret sphere of the working of the god of this world. In the inner life, in the secret place where are the springs and sources of feeling, thought, and action, the god of this present age is working, so that those under his influence are made blind. They cannot see the light. They are unable to apprehend the truth. The god of this world has been successful in his characteristic work. He has veiled the conscience, he has made the intelligence blind, he has deadened the feeling: with the result that the people do not believe, and because they do not believe they are lost.

The god of this world uses for his own ends the men, the things, and the operations of the present life. His aim is to make the Gospel and the glory of Christ of none effect. "That the light of the Gospel of the glory of Christ, who is the image of God, should not dawn upon them." Such is the purpose of the god of this world, and such is the loss sustained by those who are blinded. But the description of the work of the god of this world gives the Apostle an

opportunity of describing in full and clear terms the nature and the result of the ministry of light. Three stages in this ministry are clearly seen. The first stage reveals to us the Gospel of the glory of Christ in conflict with the power of the god of this world. There is the struggle of light with darkness. The light seeks to shine, to pierce through the veil drawn over the heart, intelligence, and conscience of men. This first conflict is described in the fourth verse. The second stage arises when the first conflict is over, and the light has so far won the victory as to shine within the heart. It is God who shined ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν. In that shining within the heart the light has won a further victory, and has transformed the character, so as to make the man in his turn a source of light. And this is the third stage of the ministry of light, described in the concluding clause of the sixth verse, πρὸς φωτισμὸν τῆς γνώσεως, for the shining forth of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ. Shining on us, shining in us, shining forth from us: such are the three stages in the ministry of light.

It may be well to justify the conclusion by a more detailed exposition. To set forth the more common view of this passage, we may quote from the paraphrase contained in the commentary on Second Corinthians by the late Dean Stanley: "If there be any veil still remaining between us and you, it is on your side, not on ours; it is a veil interposed by the god of this dark and blind and unbelieving world, to whom some surrender themselves—not by the true God, who is represented faithfully to you in our Lord and Master Jesus, whose slaves we are, and to whom alone, not to ourselves, do we wish to subject your minds. He is the true God, who, at the beginning, said, 'Let there be light,' who now pours into your hearts the full blaze of His glory from the face of Jesus Christ" (*St. Paul's Epistle to the Corinthians*, vol. ii., p. 76). Professor Agar Beet thus

sums up the meaning of ver. 6: "While we gaze upon that face as reflected in the Gospel mirror—*i.e.* while we contemplate His character as portrayed in the Gospel,—we behold *in the face of* Christ the greatness of God. That the light which filled Paul's heart was an outshining of God in creative power, and that it had shone forth in him that men might know and wonder at the grandeur of God, moved him to devote himself to the service of man by proclaiming this glorious Gospel" (*The Epistles to the Corinthians*, p. 361). Meyer thus explains: "For God, who had light to shine out of darkness, it is who caused it to shine in our hearts, in order that we should make the knowledge of the Divine glory give light in the presence of Christ. Apart from this figurative knowledge, the sense is: For it is God, the Creator of light, who bestowed on us the spiritual light communicated to us, not that we might retain it for ourselves without further communication, but that we should convey the knowledge of the Divine glory to others, in making this knowledge manifest to them in Christ, whom we teach them to know" (Meyer on *Corinthians*, vol. ii., p. 231, English translation). It seems to us that of these typical expositions, the one who most clearly apprehends the thought of the Apostle is Meyer. Professor Beet, in his able commentary, for the excellence and helpfulness of which we are all so thankful to him, has, it appears to us, not quite followed the sequence of the Apostle's thought, and Dean Stanley seems to have missed it altogether.

For the last clause, beginning *πρὸς φωτισμόν*, is not a mere explanation of the phrase, *ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις*. The shining forth of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ is from those in whose hearts God has shined unto others. The object of the shining is, not to give further light to those in whose hearts God has shined, but to convey to others by means of them the knowledge of

Christ. Meyer thus explains: "In order that the knowledge of the Divine glory may be conveyed and diffused from us to others through the preaching of Christ." This may be held as adequate if we give a wide enough meaning to the word preaching, and make it to mean preaching by living as well as preaching by words; for the bearing of the whole section constrains us to think of character and life, and not merely of speech. We cannot divide speech from life. For the essence of the Apostle's meaning here is, that he preaches what he lives by, and lives by what he preaches.

We shall seek to trace the development of the Apostle's thought. He seeks to make the Gospel of the glory of Christ shine upon the minds of men. This is his lifelong aim and purpose. Of himself he does not think, nor of his own share in the work, until he is forced to do so by the opposition of others. He vindicates himself only in so far as that vindication of his ministry serves for the main purpose of making Christ manifest unto men. "We preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus as Lord, and ourselves your servants for Jesus' sake." His business therefore is to preach Christ Jesus as Lord. But he cannot describe the ministry he has received and the object of that ministry without indicating the effects of the Gospel on his own character and life, as well as on the lives of others. Before his mind is the picture of the great conflict between light and darkness. He sees the greatness of the powers which wage war with one another. On the one hand, the powers of evil within the mind and heart of men are reinforced by the power of the "god of this world," whose work Paul conceives to be the blinding of the thoughts of men; on the other hand, is Christ, who is the image of God. From Christ shines forth the glory and the light, which is sufficient to lighten every man. Some indeed do not receive the light. But the light shineth notwithstanding. With a brief description of the powers of light and of darkness, and of

the war they wage with one another in and for possession of the hearts of men, the Apostle turns to the consideration of the next stage of the conflict. Somehow the Gospel of the glory of Christ has pierced the veil, and has come into contact with the conscience. Christ, the image of God, the visible manifestation of the invisible Father, has been manifested to men; and men have received Him, the works of the power of evil notwithstanding.

But with the manifestation of the Son, who is the image of God, there comes the manifestation of the Father. Thus the thought of the Apostle goes simply back from Him who is the image of God to God Himself. The light which shines forth from the Son is the light of the Father. The light which shines in the Christian heart is a light worthy to be compared with the light which sprang out of darkness at the bidding of the Almighty: "Let light be, and light was." So God spake in the making of the world. It is the same creative power which is at work in the hearts of men, removing blindness from the intelligence, weakness from the will, and deadness from the feeling. But as soon as the light has penetrated within the man, and shines within the heart, it transforms and purifies the whole man. As the Son is "the effulgence of the glory of God, and the very image of His substance," so those in whose hearts God does shine become in their own persons 'the light of the world.' The light has shone upon them, has passed into them, and in its progress has so transformed them, that now there shines forth from them the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ.

Into further detail we need not enter at present, nor need we say how many and how liberal are the applications which flow from this view of the passage. How great and high are the responsibilities of a Christian ministry, which is bound to realize this great apostolic ideal!

JAMES IVERACH.

APPENDIX TO DR. PEROWNE'S
"NOTES ON GENESIS."

THE MOSAIC AND GEOLOGIC HISTORY.

WE cannot obtain from geology more than an inferential knowledge as to the condition of the globe in the beginning. Probably it was an incandescent mass, surrounded by a vaporous atmosphere; not improbably the present condition of the sun may represent a very early stage of the earth's history. As this mass cooled the vapours would be precipitated, the result being dry land and ocean; the latter gathering in the accidental inequalities of the crust of the globe, which at a short distance beneath the surface would then be at a very high temperature. The most recent researches are favourable to the idea that the great majority of the gneisses and crystalline schists—the rocks commonly called metamorphic—are not rocks which have once contained fossils, but are anterior to the great mass of the fossiliferous rocks, and have been formed under conditions which, if they have ever recurred, have done so very exceptionally.

The earliest of the groups of fossiliferous rocks is called the Cambrian. It is more than probable that life began before this time, but at present we have not found any certain traces of it. The rocks of the Cambrian, especially the older beds, are not rich in fossils; still we find (even very low down) remains of various molluscs (brachiopods), crustaceans (trilobites, etc.), a sponge, and probably annelids. Towards the end of the era the number of genera and species increases, but the general character of the fauna does not materially alter; it is wholly invertebrate.

In the next group (Ordovician, or Lower Silurian of some authors), the fauna becomes much richer, but still con-

sists of representatives of the same great divisions of the organic world, sponges, corals, hydrozoa, echinodermata, crustacea, annelida, polyzoa, mollusca. In the next (Silurian or Upper Silurian), the same continues; but we have the first vertebrata (fishes). These however are not common. Some remains of plants—though rare—have been found; a very few have, indeed, been identified in the preceding period, but the evidence is often doubtful.

In the next (Devonian or Old Red Sandstone), plants are commoner, fishes (of peculiar type) are abundant; the rest of the fauna, broadly speaking, is similar to the last. In the next (Carboniferous), plants are very abundant, but of low organization, chiefly ferns, club-mosses, marestails, etc. We must however remember that apparently we have only the representatives of the flora of the swampy grounds. There must have been an upland flora, but we do not know it. Amphibians are added to the vertebrates; insects (such as beetles and various “flies”) appear to have been rather common. The Permian gives us a true reptile.

These groups form the great Palæozoic Period. In it the fauna is mainly marine, invertebrata abound, and show a gradual progress in development. The cœlenterata, the echinodermata, the annelida, and the mollusca abound, but are usually very different from those now living, and the less highly developed members are the more abundant. Plants and vertebrata are both observed about half way up, but it is not impossible that the former had long existed; markings, which some refer to sea-weeds, have been observed much lower down. Birds, mammals, and the more highly developed reptiles (except perhaps just at the end), have not been observed.

The next groups (Triassic, Jurassic, Neocomian, Cretaceous) are contained in what is called the Mesozoic or Secondary Period. Gradually the flora and fauna become more like those which now exist; the fishes become more

allied to existing genera of fishes. The abnormal crustacea have disappeared. The amphibia dwindle, and great reptiles abound both on sea and land. Rather early in the period (end of Trias) a mammal (a small marsupial) occurs, and others have been noticed later on. Still mammals appear to have been small, rare, and of low organization. Birds have not certainly been found prior to the upper part of the Jurassic, and the first (archæopteryx) was a very abnormal one. True birds occur in the Cretaceous. So far as we know, the *mammal* existed before the *bird*; but there were flying reptiles (pterodactyles, etc.) quite early in the Secondary Period.

The next great period is the Tertiary or Kainozoic. It is hardly needful to go into details. Everything gradually gets more like what now exists. The great lizards have gone; mammals are now abundant, and often large. At first they differ much from existing mammals; gradually genera and the species which still survive appear, as the old forms die out.

This I believe to be fairly accurate; but we must remember that the geologic record is imperfect.

(1) The majority of animals without any hard parts practically leave no trace (*e.g.* a "jellyfish").

(2) The hard parts are often obliterated afterwards.

(3) Our record is partial—the fossiliferous beds are mostly marine, some freshwater; that is, we have a fair idea of the flora and fauna of the sea, of rivers, valleys, deltas, lakes, and swamps, but none, or next to it, of the ordinary moorland, forest, and hillside.

(4) A large part of the world is still unknown to us.

Now of the above imperfections, (1) is probably only important to the scientific zoologist. (2) and (4) will more or less tell alike on all formations, so that we may safely reason by induction (within limits) from what we possess; *e.g.*, if we have found no fish remains in the Cambrian or

Ordovician, then either fishes did not exist or, if they did, were exceedingly rare.

(3) is more serious. We have to bear in mind that we really know very little about the ordinary terrestrial flora or fauna. Still I think we may safely argue that mammals and birds did not exist in the Palæozoic and were rare in the Mesozoic periods.

Suppose then we picture the salient features :

- (1) Light. Earth self-luminous, without counting the sun.
- (2) Precipitation of vapour. Formation of sea, and distinction of dry land.
- (3) Marine invetebrate fauna.
- (4) Abundant terrestrial vegetation (*i.e.* the Carboniferous with the Devonian).
- (5) Great saurians. Marine and terrestrial; the flying saurians might be counted as birds.
- (6) Mammalia.

Now I will take the order given in the book of Genesis for the several days.

- (i.) Light.
- (ii.) The separation of waters.
- (iii.) Distinction of land and water; creation of plant life.
- (iv.) Lights set in the firmament.
- (v.) Water peopled; air peopled.
- (vi.) Land peopled.

Now as regards the latter order: (i.) agrees with (1) in the former. (ii.) and part of (iii.) agree with (2). The remainder of (iii.), plant life, *may* be more correct than the position in the former list (4), because we should expect *plant* life to be at least as old, if not older, than animal life. This may be a case where our information is at fault.

But for (iv.) in latter list we can find no place. *Evening* and *morning*, in any strict sense, cannot exist without the sun; and astronomy forbids us to believe that sun and moon can be thus separated from the early history of the earth.

(v.) The appearance of "whales" (saurians) and birds would do, but the peopling of the water generally is the earliest thing we know; moreover, if the "creeping thing" in (vi.) means *insects*, these were early in appearance.

Hence I do not think that the order given by the writer in Genesis can be treated scientifically. Do I think it an "old wife's tale"? No; I believe it to a great extent a revelation, but one into which, for purposes we can well understand, the human element enters largely. I look upon it as a poem or word-picture, whereby some great truths were conveyed, as in a rough sketch, to men. The pictures probably represent visions; the evening and the morning the gathering into shape and fading into darkness of the vision, like a dissolving view (putting darkness for the lamp-light in the scene).¹ I think that the personality of the seer also comes in, and he represents the process of creation in a series of visions, in what I may call his own natural order of thought.

To the end of ver. 6 he narrates the events as the cosmogony of the day suggests, but points out that all is God's work. In ver. 7 we have the primary idea of land and water separating. Then, to the dweller away from the sea coast, whose main and central idea was the land, to whom perhaps the rocks and sands of the desert were an abomination, the primary idea in fitting the land for occupation would be clothing it with verdure. The reference to sun and moon next in order I look upon as a result of the astronomy of the time, which regards them as satellites of the earth rather than it as a satellite of the sun; and this would be another stage of preparation.

We then proceed to the peopling of the earth. Here it seems to me that the seer proceeds gradually towards the crowning work: first bringing in those creatures most

¹ On evening and morning see P. H. Mason's *Hebrew Exercise Book*, pref. to concluding part, vii.

remote from man and his uses; and, lastly, man himself when all was ready. When the farm was stocked, the farmer came.

Thus I think you cannot "harmonize," except in the widest and most general sense, the Scripture account with that of science; but I also think that the former is so vague, so obviously popular in form, so concerned only about the central truth, that to talk of contradiction is useless. A child or uneducated person might give us an account of some complicated process, which was true in the main, yet full of small inaccuracies and mistakes in sequence and in theory.

Of course I am aware of the correspondences between the early Chaldæan cosmogony and that in Genesis, but to dwell on this subject is beside my purpose. I will merely add that the former, as it has been well said, is saturated with polytheism, and that the expurgation of such an element, at this epoch of the world's history, is to me a mark of inspiration.

T. G. BONNEY.

THE ARAMAIC GOSPEL.

THE NEW CRITERION.

THERE are two facts which, as we have seen from our preliminary paper of last month, are almost universally conceded: (1) that our Lord ordinarily spoke Aramaic; and (2) that Matthew wrote the *Logia τῆ Ἑβραϊδὶ διαλέκτῳ*. But when we step beyond this, we come into the arena of debate. If we ask, In what language did Matthew write? or, *What* did he write? we receive very discordant replies. It might be supposed that all who admitted that Christ *spoke* Aramaic would also admit that, if His words were originally written in any Semitic tongue, they would be written precisely as spoken. But this is not the case.

Even so high an authority as the late Dr. Franz Delitzsch believed that the Saviour *spoke* in the vernacular, yet maintained that the *literature* of the period existed only in New-Hebrew; and in commenting on the words of Papias, though he admits that the word *Ἑβραϊστί* was sometimes used for *Χαλδαϊστί*, he yet holds that "it is very improbable that Matthew wrote *Aramaic*." Having been for some years a devoted student of Delitzsch's Hebrew New Testament, it was a wrench to me to doubt his accuracy. There was however this grave difficulty. If Delitzsch be correct, the words of Jesus, as we know them in the Greek Testament, have undergone a twofold translation: first from Aramaic into New-Hebrew; then from this into Greek. That is not a view one would *prefer* to adopt, if one might choose. It is therefore a point worth considering, whether the Aramaic fragments embedded in our present Greek Gospels may not be words transliterated from a primitive document—words which were felt too precious to translate. May not these words be samples of the dialect in which the whole of the *Logia* was written? If so, since these specimens are uniformly Targumic Aramaic, Matthew wrote in the same language as Onkelos. Should the theory advocated in these papers prove to be of permanent value in the solution of the problems of the Gospels, we have "the moment of its genesis" in the surmise, which gradually deepened into a fixed conviction, that the *Urevangelium* was written in the language of the Jewish Targums—not however without sundry dialectal peculiarities found in the Samaritan Targum. Delitzsch tells us that one of his friends suggested that he should translate the New Testament, not into Hebrew, but into Aramaic, since that was the language spoken in Palestine in the days of Christ; but he adds, "dieser Wunsch beruht auf einer Illusion."¹ Perhaps not. At all events we are willing to hinge the

¹ Quoted in Kautzsch's *Grammatik des Biblisch-Aramäischen*, p. 5.

matter here : That language which best explains the verbal divergences in our present Gospels must be voted to be the one in which the *Logia* was written.

Even more discordant are the views as to *what* Matthew originally wrote, what would be included in the *Logia*. Was it the entire Gospel known to us ; or simply the discourses of our Lord ; or the discourses *plus* some narratives which gave occasion to the discourses ? Several *methods* have been devised by which to arrive at the contents of the *Logia*. We can but enumerate them here, but will give them a fuller investigation by-and-by.

1. There is what we may call the *harmonistic* method. Those *pericopæ* which three—or in some cases two—of the synoptists possess in common were, in the judgment of Eichhorn, to be assigned to the Syro-Chaldaic *Urevangelium* ; except those passages which, though found even in all three Gospels, are scattered in different connexions (*Einleitung*, vol. i., § 56).

2. We have the *mathematical* method. Thus we may designate the method of Weisse, who arrived at the contents of the *Logia* by subtracting the canonical Mark from Matthew iii.—xxviii. ; or, by subtracting from Luke, (1) what he possesses in common with Mark, and (2) what is found in Luke only. The residue is almost the same in both cases ; and as Matthew and Luke were independent of each other, they must, in these passages, have been indebted to a common “ source ” ; and since this residue consists almost exclusively of *discourses*, it was proclaimed to be the long-lost *Logia*. The canonical Mark and the *Logia* are thus two original, independent documents.

3. We have the *subjective* method. We apply this designation to the ingenious theories of Dr. Bernhard Weiss.¹ He has proved very satisfactorily (*a*) that the

¹ Weiss' *Manual of Introduction* in Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton's “ Foreign Biblical Library,” vol. ii., pp. 225, 247.

Logia did not contain discourses merely, but also some narratives which served as a setting to the precious gems; and (b) that Mark was in some passages *indebted* to the *Logia*, while in other passages our present Greek Matthew was indebted to Mark. The consideration which directed Weiss in threading his way through this maze, and in deciding how many of Mark's narratives belonged to the *Logia*, and how many were original to him, was this: In what cases does Mark show "an inferior text"? Taking it for granted that all borrowers amplify, he proceeded thus: when Matthew (or Luke) gives a "short, sketchy, and withal polished and condensed" form of a narrative, whereas Mark "gives a richer and freer embellishment of the same, and yet seems ever going back to this simpler form, so familiar to him that his adherence to it often disturbs the flow of his own description," such parts are borrowed by Mark from the *Logia*. With whatever scholarship and sobriety of judgment this method may be applied, it is evident that it affords too much scope for the play of subjectivity. What two men would always agree on what constitutes "an inferior text"? The method lacks objective certitude—even though in some hands it may lead to correct results: a more tangible dividing-rod is eminently desirable.

4. As supplying to some extent this desideratum, we would respectfully submit for consideration a *linguistic* method. We venture to think that it yields more objective certitude than the foregoing, and leaves less room for caprice and egoism. If the method be accepted, all who are conversant with Greek and Aramaic are well-nigh certain to come to the same conclusions; and thus some degree of scientific accuracy will be attainable. Besides this, although our investigations were conducted in ignorance, or forgetfulness, of the results of Dr. Weiss, it is gratifying to find how nearly our table of contents of the *Logia* corresponds

with his (*Matthäusevangelium*, pp. 18-35). When the same answer is obtained to a mathematical problem by two distinct modes of working, each confirms the other; and the attainment of closely similar results by the totally independent use of two different methods is a confirmation of both. We proceed now therefore to the exposition of

THE LINGUISTIC METHOD.

A careful and minute study of a Greek harmony of the Gospels reveals a threefold classification of their contents.

A.—There are numerous passages—sections, verses, or phrases—in which each of the evangelists *stands alone*.

B.—There are many instances in which two, or sometimes three, evangelists *agree verbatim*; or at all events the differences are not greater than may have taken place in process of transcription from a Greek text, nor than are actually found in different MSS. of the same Greek author.

C.—There are other instances where the parallel passages *agree in thought, but not in words*. Verse after verse, thought corresponds with thought, phrase with phrase; and yet there is far from a verbal identity. The passages are tantamount, but not identical; the resemblance is substantial, but not verbal. It is these portions which we shall claim for the *Logia*, and shall try to show that in many instances these verbal divergences are traceable to a variant translation of a common Aramaic original. The distinction between classes B and C is, for our present purpose, radical. Do the parallel passages resemble each other substantially *or* verbally? That is our criterion. And taking this dividing-rod in our hands, we shall use it calmly and firmly. We shall allow no preconceptions to influence us as to what a primitive Gospel might be expected to contain. We shall be guided solely by linguistic considerations. Those sections or verses which bear marks of being translation work we shall claim for

the *Logia*; and those in which the agreement is verbal we shall not claim, except in some instances to be afterwards specified.

The question we would now therefore ask is this: What are the indications of translation work? What are the phenomena which present themselves regularly, in college life, for instance, in connexion with productions that are known to be translations from the same foreign author?

May we be forgiven if we first mention an abnormal phenomenon? It *is said* that occasionally in the schools on the Continent *and elsewhere*, it has been observed that there is a remarkable similarity in some few examination papers: line after line is the same, not only in thought, but in the minutest details of words. The attention of the ever-unsuspecting examiner is at last aroused to this resemblance, and he feels obliged to attribute it to one or other of two causes: either these men sat near each other during the examination, and copied in succession from some one paper; or each of them has in his possession the same "crib," and has committed it to memory. In the latter case we have no *bonâ fide* translation work at all; in the former, we have one translation and several transcriptions. In accordance with these phenomena, when, in our microscopic study of the harmony of the Gospels, we come upon passages where, for one or more verses, the agreement is *verbal*, we shall feel justified in saying: "This is not translation work." Those passages where the verbal identity is evident we shall, with few exceptions, relegate to class B, and shall not claim them for the *Logia*. The exceptions referred to are those cases in which, embedded in a narrative which we take to be Aramaic, we find the *words* of the Lord Jesus given in two or three evangelists *in verbal agreement*; and we shall then raise the question, whether these identical Greek words may not (since the narrative setting is Aramaic) be the words actually spoken

by our Lord, transmitted with faithful, literal accuracy exactly as they were uttered. Whether the *longer* sections and narratives, which present verbal agreement in the Greek, ever formed part of one and the same primitive document; whether there is any affinity or thread of connexion between these detached fragments, may furnish a theme for other investigators; but the task will be much simplified when the *Logia* has been eliminated.

In seeking now to classify the ordinary indications of translation work, we intend in almost every case to give *illustrations* from the two translations of the Hebrew Scriptures, presented respectively in the Septuagint and the New Testament quotations. The wisdom of this procedure will appear more clearly later on, but some advantages may be mentioned now. (1) The circumstances are precisely similar. On the one hand, we have two translations from the Hebrew; and, on the other, we have presumably two, or three, evangelists translating from the Aramaic *Logia*. (2) Both primary documents are in a Semitic language, and hence the points of resemblance are closer than if our illustrations were drawn from a European language. (3) It will curb our imagination. We shall escape any danger into which an exuberant fancy might fall, in the selection of "indications of translation"; for we shall rigorously confine ourselves to those which are *actually present* in the existing records. (4) When we have arranged our classes of the discrepancies actually occurring in the two extant Greek translations of the Hebrew Scriptures, we might argue from analogy that the same *kinds* of variations would occur in the work of two Greek scholars translating from an Aramaic exemplar; and it is no slight confirmation of the soundness of our hypothesis, that there is an exact correspondence. (5) The analogy goes further. When we are exhibiting the verbal discrepancies between the New Testament quotations and the Hebrew text, we are dealing

with two inspired records. We have thus a most instructive study as to what extent verbal divergences are compatible with inspiration. And ever bearing in mind that the evangelists were inspired of God, we shall have a *safe guide* as to how far it is reverent to suppose these inspired men capable of verbal inaccuracy in their translations from the Aramaic, if we confine ourselves strictly to those kinds of divergence which do actually occur between the Old Testament and the New. We shall not adduce one species of discrepancy between the evangelists which has not been shown to exist in the New Testament as compared with the Hebrew. (6) Inasmuch as the New Testament quotations have not been classified in this manner heretofore, our labour will incidentally serve as a small contribution to *that* important subject.

And now we will re-state our question: *What are the well recognised indications of translation work?*

I. The surest indication of good, honest work in translating from a foreign author is when the different members of a class express the thought of the original in diverse ways, corresponding to the idiosyncrasy of each student. No one knows so well as an examiner of papers translating from some foreign classic, into how many ways the same thought *may* be thrown; and if each man translates independently, there will be agreement in substance, but not in words. We cannot illustrate *this* point very well from the translations of the Hebrew as presented in the LXX. and New Testament, because confessedly they are not independent translations. Whether the New Testament writers translated directly from the Hebrew, or used a recension of the LXX. slightly differing from that which we at present possess, it is apparent that the translator of our New Testament quotations had in mind a familiar Greek text, and only deviated from it when the Hebrew MS. from which he was translating seemed to *him* to demand an emendation.

II. A desire to be literal leads a translator to introduce *idioms* into his work which are foreign to his native tongue. The Latin scholar is in danger of falling into a Latinized style, even when he is not translating. When the student of the Greek classics passes from the study of Xenophon and Thucydides to that of the Septuagint, he is struck by the deviations from classical propriety; and if he is at the same time familiar with Hebrew, he observes that these are in most cases distinctly traceable to an imitation of the Hebrew idiom. The Septuagint became a sort of model for Greek-speaking Jews; and thus some of its peculiarities became stereotyped into a dialect known as Hellenistic Greek. Winer, in his *Grammar of New Testament Greek*, has a valuable chapter on "the Hebrew-Aramaic colouring of New Testament diction." It is quite unnecessary to quote instances of what occurs often on every page of the LXX. and New Testament.

III. Every examiner knows that it is very difficult to secure uniformity in the strict rendering of a verb; even when the meaning of the verb is correctly given, there is diversity in giving the precise voice, tense, and mood. We find the same freedom in the rendering of Hebrew verbs in the LXX. and New Testament. For instance:

Exod. xii. 46 & LXX.: And a bone thereof ye shall not break.

συντρίψετε.

John xix. 36: And a bone of him shall not be broken.

συντριβήσεται.

Ps. cxvii. 1: Praise Him, all ye people (so Heb.).

ἐπαινήσατε.

Rom. xv. 11: Let all the people praise Him.

ἐπαινεσάτωσαν

Compare Matt. xv. 4, τελευτάτω, with Exod. xxi. 16, τελευτήσει.

Isa. xxv. 8, κατέπιεν ὁ θάνατος, with 1 Cor. xv. 54, κατεπόθη.

IV. When the translation is made from a Semitic text without points, translators may differ as to what *vowels* should be supplied. The insertion of different vowels

among the same consonants may cause a great difference in the translation.

Ps. ii. 9:	Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron.	תִּרְעֵם.
Rev. ii. 27 & LXX.:	Thou shalt shepherdise them (<i>ποιμανεῖς</i>).	תִּרְעֵם.
Ps. li. 6:	Justified when thou speakest.	בְּדַבְּרֶךָ.
Rom. iii. 4 & LXX.:	Justified in thy sayings.	בְּדַבְּרֶיךָ.
Gen. xlvii. 31:	Israel bowed on the head of the bed.	הִפְטָה.
Heb. xi. 21 & LXX.:	Israel bowed on the head of his staff.	הִפְטָה.
Prov. iii. 12:	<i>Even as a father</i> the son in whom he delighteth.	וַיִּכְאֵב.
Heb. xii. 6 & LXX.:	<i>And scourgeth</i> every son whom he receiveth.	וַיִּכְאֵב.

V. It is a well known fact that very few words in any language are *univocal*. We scarcely notice this in our native tongue until we try to translate it into another language; but we are very sensitive as to how equivocal the words in any foreign language are. The first few weeks with a Latin dictionary mark a period of pain and suffering in the life of a young student, remembered ever afterwards. The long list of meanings which every Latin verb seems to possess is at that stage most bewildering, and the difficulty of selecting the meaning which seems to suit the chaotic context most distressing. This remains a difficulty even when men become proficient in a language; men will always differ as to which word best represents the original. The following are some of the instances of diverse rendering of the same Hebrew word:

- Ps. lxxviii. 2: I will *utter* dark sayings of old.
The word נָבַע means (1) to pour or gush forth;
(2) to utter, speak. Each is appropriated by the
translators: Matt. xiii. 35, *ἐρέξομαι*; LXX., *φθέγγομαι*.
- Ps. xxii. 23 (22): I will *declare* Thy name unto my brethren.
נִבְּרָה becomes *διηγέσομαι* in LXX.; *ἀπαγγελῶ* in
Heb. ii. 12.

- Job v. 13: He *taketh* the wise in their own *craftiness*.
 ܕܠܕ is καταλαμβάνων in LXX.; δρασσόμενος in 1 Cor.
 iii. 19.
 The word ܕܠܕ vacillates between "prudence" and
 "cunning." Accordingly LXX. gives φρόνησις;
 1 Cor. iii. 19 παουργία.
- Mal. iii. 1: And he shall *prepare* thy way before thee.
 ܩܦܦ means to turn, look, overhaul, clear out, get
 ready. So LXX. gives ἐπιβλέψεται; Matt. xi. 10,
 κατασκευάσει.
- Jer. xxxi. 32: And I was a husband to them (ܐܚܘܝܢܐܘܢ).
 Since ܐܚܘܝܢܐܘܢ means both to marry and to divorce, LXX.
 (chap. xxxviii. 32) and Heb. viii. 9 have ἡμέλησα
 I regarded them not.

VI. There may be discrepancies in the exemplars from which the translation is made; and thus, through no fault of the translators, their work may vary. Classical scholars know well how difficult it is to secure a correctly *printed text* of the classic authors; and how much worse off we should be, if the work were, without revision, stereotyped as it comes from the compositor, is very evident. Equally liable to error, if not more so, were the MSS. When men of imperfect education took the trade of transcriber, and with imperfect tools and weary eyes wrote on from morn till night a text of unjoined capital letters, without vowels and usually without any space between the words, we can well imagine what "errors of the scribe" would creep into the text. And when we bear in mind that the translator in perusing a MS. is liable to the same blunders as the scribe, and may fail to *read* his MS. accurately, we see that the possibility of variant translations is thereby almost doubled.

The sources of error may be classified thus :

1. One letter may be mistaken for another, or two words which at a cursory glance closely resemble each other may be confounded.

Isa. xlii. 4: The *isles* shall hope in His law. א״ם.
 LXX. & Matt. xii. 21: The *nations* shall hope in His name. גוים.

Amos ix. 12 : That the remnant of Edom אַדוֹם they may possess.	יִרְשׁוּ.
Acts xv. 17 : That the remnant of men אַדָּם may seek Me.	יִרְשׁוּ.
Isa. xxviii. 16 : He that believeth shall not make haste.	יַחִישׁ.
Rom. ix. 33 : He that believeth shall not be ashamed.	יִבִּישׁ.
Hab. i. 5 : Behold ye <i>among the nations</i> , and gaze, etc.	בְּגוֹיִם.
Acts xiii. 41 : Behold, ye <i>despisers</i> .	בְּנָדְרִים.

2. The scribe or translator may err in the omission or insertion of a letter.

Joel iii. 2 : Upon the bondsmen . . . I will pour My Spirit.	הַעֲבָדִים.
Acts ii. 18 : Upon My bondsmen. . . .	עֲבָדֵי.
Ps. xvi. 11 : There is fulness of joy in Thy presence.	שִׁבְעָה.
Acts ii. 28 : Thou shalt fill me with joy in Thy presence.	חֲשֵׁבְעָה.
Exod. ix. 16 : To show thee My power.	הַרְאָתְךָ.
Rom. ix. 17 : To show in thee My power.	הַרְאָת בְּךָ.

3. In transcription or translation two letters may be transposed.

Hos. xiii. 14 : O death, <i>I will be</i> thy plagues.	אֵהִי.
1 Cor. xv. 55 : O death, <i>where</i> is thy victory ?	אֵיִה.
Hab. ii. 4 : Behold, his soul is lifted up, it is not upright in him.	
Heb. x. 38 : If he shrink back, my soul has not pleasure in him.	
Hebrew text has הִנֵּה עֹפְלָה לֹא יִשְׂרָה נַפְשׁוֹ בּוֹ.	
Heb. x. 38 requires הִנֵּה עֹלְףָ לֹא יִרְצָה נַפְשׁוֹ בּוֹ.	

4. In a text which does not always leave a space between the words, it is likely that different translators would divide the letters differently into words. There are several instances in which the Jewish scribes were themselves doubtful as to the correct division of letters into words. In the *Massoreth Ha-massoreth* of Elias Levita, as edited by Dr. Ginsburg, there are (p. 193) fifteen cases specified in which a word given entire in the printed text is in the Massoretic margin divided into two ; and eight instances in which the text has two words, while the margin runs the two into one. One illustration of each will suffice. In Psalm x. 10 the word הַלְכָאִים, "the helpless ones," occurs

in the text; but the Qeri divides it into two words, הַל כְּאִים, "the host of weary ones." In Isaiah ix. 6 Kethibh has לָם רַבָּה, "to them the government shall be great"; whereas the Qeri has לְמִרְבָּה, "as for the increase of His government."

There is one instance of this in the New Testament quotations:

Isa. liii. 8: By oppression and a judgment he was taken away.

LXX. & Acts viii. 33: In *His* humiliation His judgment was taken away. (In many MSS. the word "His" is omitted.)

Hebrew is כִּיעַזַר וּמִשִּׁפֵּט לָקַח

Acts viii. 33 requires בְּעִזְרוֹ מִשִּׁפֵּטוֹ לָקַח

5. There are other cases in which it is impossible by a simple re-arrangement or substitution of letters to account for the rendering of the Hebrew text found in the New Testament. One is obliged in such cases to say, either that the text of the Hebrew exemplar was very corrupt, or that we have a "free" quotation. The number of these is not so great as some suppose, but they do exist; *e.g.*—

Gen. xv. 14: Afterward they shall come out with great substance.

Acts vii. 7: Afterward they shall come out, and serve Me in this place.

Ps. lxxviii. 18 (19): Thou hast received gifts among men.

Eph. iv. 8: He gave gifts to men.

Compare also Amos v. 26 with Acts vii. 43, and Isa. x. 23 with Rom. ix. 28.

VII. If the translator write two copies of his work, there may be some points in which, in his second copy, he may see cause to make some slight alterations; and thus we may have "various readings" in a work, which are not due to subsequent scribes, but can be traced back to the translator himself, and are due to an uncertainty as to the reading of the original exemplar.

Let us now reverse the conditions. We have thus far

been investigating the phenomena which ordinarily occur in connexion with work known to be a translation from some foreign author. But suppose it to be a disputed point whether the writing of some three men *is* translation work from an unknown foreign author, how should we proceed to detect it? Suppose we have a passage in three English authors which we surmise is not in any one case original. It savours of Germany. There is that indefinable quality about it which marks all German-English translations. The authors cannot have used each other's books. How should we proceed to confirm or disprove our surmise that each has been translating from a German author who is unknown to us? This, I need not say, is precisely the position in which my hypothesis places us. There are certain passages in our synoptic Gospels which have a strong Aramaic colour. We have very insufficient *external* evidence as to the subject. Papias and Pantænus and others tell of a Gospel written in Aramaic, but they tell only of Matthew as having written such a work, whereas we think we notice the Aramaic colour in some passages in all the three Gospels. Besides this, many scholars have thrown serious doubts on the *trustworthiness* of Papias. He had peculiar views on the millenarian question. Eusebius regarded him as a "noodle"; σφόδρα σμικρὸς τὸν νοῦν is his blunt estimate of him. Papias collected some very silly stories about the Saviour, and apparently regarded nothing unworthy of Christ, if it favoured his pet doctrines. Therefore some eminent scholars, as Erasmus and Calvin, have distrusted his evidence altogether: though it is but fair to say that *most* scholars would endorse the words of Meyer, that "a simple historical remark, which stood in no connexion either with millenarianism or fabulous miracles, cannot *à priori* be regarded as suspicious; especially if, as in the present case, there is added the confirmation of the whole subsequent tradition of the Church." But some of

my readers may be sceptical of Church traditions, and insist still on doubting the accuracy of the statement of Papias as to the Aramaic *Logia*. Be it so. Our position is not in the slightest affected. We are grateful to Papias for the suggestion, but if the reader insists, we will proceed as though the Church were silent on the subject. The fact still remains, there are certain passages in the synoptists which impress us as being translations from a common Aramaic document. How shall we proceed to prove our surmise well founded? Which of our indications of translation work will be of most use to us now? Let us see.

I. If in the parallel passages in the synoptic Gospels we find "resemblance in substance, but not in words," this is the indication that first places us on the alert. If, *e.g.*, one evangelist says *πορεύου εἰς εἰρήνην*, while the other says *ὑπάγε εἰς εἰρήνην*; if one says *ἀνέστη*, and another *ἠγέρθη*, our attention is aroused. We shall not feel secure to build on such superficial cases; but it is in such passages that we begin to dig for deeper indications of the fact that the evangelists are translating from some common document—whether in absolute independence, or with a memory dominated by some current Greek translation of the *Logia*, we must afterwards investigate.

II. If in such parallel passages we notice an unusually rich Aramaic colouring, and, III., if the verbs differ in voice or tense, we have confirmatory evidence. This evidence is much increased if IV. be also present: that is, if two divergent Greek words in the several Gospels can be shown to be derived from the same Aramaic consonants, only differently vocalized. But No. V. is our main support. If in homologous passages which possess some or all of these marks we come across two Greek words, in two several Gospels, which are unlike in meaning, but these meanings can be shown to belong to one and the same Aramaic word, we may then with confidence affirm that

the two Greek words have been translated from the same Aramaic original. For instance, Matthew vi. 12 says: "Forgive us our debts," *ὀφειλήματα*; Luke xi. 4: "Forgive us our sins," *ἁμαρτίας*. Why this disagreement in so peculiarly sacred a passage? If the prayer had originally been given by our Lord in Greek, such a diversity would be impossible. When we remember however, that the Aramaic word *חוב* means (1) a trespass, (2) a debt, we perceive that the two evangelists were translating the same word *חובנא*. We intend to adduce about *thirty* clear cases like this.

Our most numerous instances will, as in our illustrations, fall under VI. If in those parallel passages in the synoptists which are redolent with Aramaisms, and present a substantial, but not verbal agreement, we note that the verbal differences can, by re-translation, be shown to be due to a mistake between two Aramaic letters, or to a confusion between two Aramaic words, alike in sound or appearance; or to the transposition of two letters, or the omission of a letter in the original, we may with almost equal confidence affirm that the evangelists were translating from the same Aramaic source.

VII. We hope also to show that some of the most ancient of the "various readings" in the New Testament are traceable to a variant translation of a primitive Aramaic document, or perhaps a "various reading" in different copies of the document itself.

There are several deeply interesting and important ramifications of our theory into which we hope to enter, but upon which we cannot now expatiate. Suffice it to say that we are hopeful that our theory will establish its claims to be regarded as a demonstration by satisfying the test to which every valid hypothesis should conform—that it gives a fairly "satisfactory explanation of all the phenomena in question."

J. T. MARSHALL.

NOTES ON GENESIS.

26. *Let Us make.*—I have already commented on the use of the plural. It must be confessed that it is difficult to understand why the plural should be used in only a few passages in the O.T., and why it should occur in the particular passages in which we meet with it. Here indeed the solemnity of the occasion may account for its use. The creation of man is not only the last in an ascending series of creative acts, it is something more: it is the meeting-point between the world and God, between the intelligent creature, as the representative of all created things, and the Creator. Man, in the words of Theodoret, is the connecting link, the bond which ties together all creation (*σύνδεσμος πάντων*). Hence now for the first and only time in the narrative the Creator speaks of *Himself*. Before it is always “Let some *thing*—light, vegetation, animals,—come into being”; now it is God taking counsel with Himself. “Let Us make.”

Of the passages already quoted in which the plural form occurs, chap. iii. 22 presents the most difficulty. I hope to discuss it in the note on that verse.

Man (Heb. *adam*), the genus *homo*, the race as such, not the individual man, as is plain from the plural which follows, “let *them* have dominion,” and again in the next verse: “So God created man in His own image, in the image of God created He *him*; male and female created He *them*.”

In Our image.—See excursus below. The rule and lordship here given to man over all the other creatures of God’s hand, though not the very image itself, are an immediate consequence of his bearing the Divine image. *Let them have dominion*: literally, “let them trample upon.” The word is a genuine old Hebrew word, and in the sense of “ruling” is unknown in Aramaic, and is only rarely found

in the later language of the Targums and the Talmud. In the enumeration which follows of the different classes of creatures, tenants respectively of the water, the air, and the earth, the insertion of the words, "and over all the earth," between "the cattle" and "the creeping things" is certainly strange; and it has been conjectured that the word *chayath* has dropped out, and that we ought to read "over all [the beasts of] the earth." The emendation is plausible, though it has not the support of any of the ancient versions, except the Peshito. It has been urged indeed that the words are necessary to denote that man's lordship is over inanimate as well as animate nature; but if this is intended, it is difficult to understand why they are interposed between the cattle and the creeping thing; they would more naturally have stood at the end of the verse.

27. *So God created man in His own image,
in the image of God created He him;
male and female created He them.*

The outburst of joy in the thought of man's creation, and high destiny and sovereign power, the crown on his head, and the sceptre in his hand, and royalty on his brow, in his look, and in his gait, finds expression in rhythmic cadence. The language falls into a triplet, with the repetition characteristic of Hebrew poetry, though what we have here is not formal poetry, but the involuntary, spontaneous poetry of exalted religious feeling.

Compare the similar statement in chap. v. 1, 2, where the Elohistic writer resumes his narrative:

"In the day that God created man,
in the likeness of God made He him;
male and female created He them."

Nothing is said in these verses to indicate what the view of the sacred writer was as to the number of human beings originally created. He makes no direct statement on the subject. They may have been many pairs, or a single pair.

The expression, "male and female created He them," may refer only to the distinction of sexes, and not to the fact that only a single pair was created. The next document however clearly implies the creation of a single pair and the descent of the human race from them, and there is nothing here to contradict the inference. In fact, as all the ancient cosmogonies represent mankind as descended from a single pair, it is natural to suppose, in the absence of proof to the contrary, that this was the writer's belief. But his object is not to insist upon this, which would probably be taken for granted, but rather on the fact that man is created in the Divine image, and with the original differences of the sexes (see Matt. xix. 4), in opposition to some of the heathen cosmogonies, which taught an androgynous, or hermaphrodite, origin of the race; and that consequently in their relation to God, and as partakers in likeness to Him, all men are equal. It has been argued that, in the case of the lower animals, at all events, the creation of more than a single pair may not only be gathered from the narrative, but was imperatively necessary for the preservation of the species, inasmuch as they prey upon one another, and would infallibly have destroyed one another, unless the numbers of the different species had been sufficient to insure their preservation. But this consideration did not exist in the view of the writer. According to him, animals were not carnivorous in their primitive condition (see ver. 30). They lived, like man himself, on vegetables; and consequently there was no risk of the extinction of the different species.

28. The blessing here pronounced on man runs in very similar terms to the blessing pronounced in ver. 22 on fishes and birds; only here man is not merely to *fill* the earth, as the fish are to *fill* the sea, he is also to *subdue* it, and to have dominion over all the other creatures of God's hand. "The earth hath He given to the children of men" (Ps. cxv. 16).

This the first commandment to man is given in the form of a blessing. "Hereby this became the primary law of man's condition upon earth, a law which, like the other laws of Nature—the Lawgiver being Himself the Maker and Fashioner of that to which the law was given, fulfilled itself; so firmly and indelibly was it wrought into the essential instincts of man's being, and into the permanent necessities of his condition."

29. Following the Divine command to "replenish the earth," there comes the Divine provision for human sustenance. This Divine word does not, like those that went before, introduce a creative act. *Behold*. Attention is drawn to a new circumstance. God is not the God of creation only, but the God of providence. *I have given*. Man's life and destiny are not at the mercy of chance or fate, they are part of a Divine order. The food assigned to men (ver. 29) and to other animals (ver. 30) is entirely vegetable. To men are given as their food all plants bearing *seed*—i.e. cereals and leguminous plants—and all that bear *fruit*; to the other animals "every green herb," an expression which seems to be the equivalent of the word rendered "grass" (ver. 12), which however, as we have seen, has a much wider meaning, including all vegetation not comprised in the enumeration of ver. 29. The phrase "green herb" (lit. "greenness of herb") only occurs once again (chap. ix. 3). Nothing is said of other kinds of food which did not involve the taking of life, such as milk and honey for men, and grain for birds and beasts, the object being merely to show that the original order did not contemplate the use of animal food.

It must be confessed that it is very difficult to reconcile the statement in ver. 30, in its plain and obvious sense, with our knowledge and observation. Whatever may have been the case with man, who may have subsisted originally only on vegetable diet, it is certain that there were carnivorous

animals in the geological periods, and that these preyed upon one another precisely as the same species or their successors do now. Their very conformation, the structure of their jaws, teeth, stomach, etc., shows that this was intended in their creation; and the destruction of some species would be necessary for the preservation of others. But the truth is, the writer's point of view is ideal. He has no concern with a state of things of which he could have had no possible knowledge. His eye is fixed on the original paradisaical condition of things, when man and the inferior animals lived in perfect harmony and peace together. To him it did not seem that the dominion given to man implied that he was at liberty to take the life of the animals he ruled, for his own subsistence or enjoyment. This is the important matter. Animal food can only be had at the cost of animal life, and the taking of animal life was a breach of the Divine order, which from the beginning provides only for the continuance and sustenance of life. No hint is given anywhere in this majestic story of creation of any possible interruption of its course; there is no jarring note of discord, there is no vision, no shadow of death. Life, love, peace, order, perfection—this, according to the earliest records (Gen. i. and ii.), was the original constitution of the world. "And it was so," says the writer (ver. 30) as if to emphasize this original condition of things, as if to mark it as a Divine ordinance.

Immediately after the Fall however we meet with the taking of animal life: first, as a Divine act for the clothing of Adam and Eve (chap. iii. 21); and again as offered in sacrifice by Abel with the Divine approval. But it is not till much later, in the covenant with Noah after the flood, that the use of animal food is expressly permitted. "Every moving thing that liveth shall be food for you; as the green herb have I given you all" (chap. ix. 3): the only restriction put upon the use of meat being that the blood

is not to be eaten : " But flesh with the life thereof, which is the blood thereof, shall ye not eat " (chap. ix. 4).

This primitive abstinence from animal food is in accordance with the traditions of other nations. So Plato (*Legg.* vi. 782) speaks of a time when animals did not devour one another, as they do now, when beef was unknown as an article of food, when no animal was even offered in sacrifice to a god. Then men fed on fruits and cakes and honey, and brought them as pure sacrifices to the gods ; when they considered it a sin either to eat flesh themselves or to pollute the altars with blood ; when they partook freely of things without life, but abstained from things with life. Similar testimonies will be found in Diog. Laert. viii. 1, 12 ; Plut., *Symph.* viii. 8, 3 ; so too Ovid (*Met.* i. 103-106 ; xv. 96, etc ; *Fasti* i. 337, etc.) speaks of a golden age when men lived only on fruits and vegetables, and offered only unbloody sacrifices to the gods ; and Virgil (*Georg.* i. 130) represents even the beasts of prey as not originally carnivorous. Compare Pope's *Essay on Man* iii. 152, etc. :

" Man walk'd with beast, joint tenant of the shade ;
The same his table, and the same his bed ;
No murder cloth'd him, and no murder fed.

The shrine with gore unstain'd, with gold undrest,
Unbrib'd, unbloody, stood the blameless priest ;
Heaven's attribute was universal care,
And Man's prerogative to rule, but spare."

The Brahmans, the Buddhists, and other Eastern sects, were strict vegetarians (Lassen, *Ind. Alt.* i. 788-793) ; and Pythagoras enjoined a vegetable diet upon his disciples, forbidding them to take animal life under any pretence, except for their own safety when they were attacked by wild beasts. (See Ovid, *Met.* xv. 75-142.)

In the Old Testament Scriptures themselves a return to the primitive condition of perfect harmony and peace is to be the blessing of the Messianic age. In the glowing

language of the prophets, then too, as at the first, "the wolf shall dwell with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the kid; and the calf and the young lion and the fatling together; . . . and the lion shall eat straw like the ox. . . . They shall not hurt nor destroy in all My holy mountain" (Isa. xi. 5-9; lxxv. 25).

31. As before (vers. 10, 12, 18, 21, 25), we have the expression of the Divine satisfaction at several stages of the creative work, so now in the survey of the whole, "God saw everything that He had made"; and instead of the simple expression, "God saw that it was good," we have now the more emphatic, "And, *behold*, it was *very* good." (On "behold" see above, ver. 29.) It is a little remarkable that the words of approval do not follow the creation of man, but are reserved for the final retrospect. Thus the sixth day ends. The note of joy which has sounded all through the chapter swells at the close into its richest, fullest expression, because now in all its parts and in their marvellous combination and mutual adaptation the beauty and perfection of the whole, as revealing and reflecting in the highest degree the wisdom and love of the Creator, are seen. "Jehovah rejoiceth in His works"; and the creation mirrors His joy. So of the eternal Wisdom it is said (Prov. viii. 30) that it was

"Rejoicing always before Him;
Rejoicing in His habitable earth."

In the lyric echo of this story in Psalm civ. there is the same note of gladness and exultation, as though even sin (ver. 35) and death (vers. 29, 30) could not mar or dim the glorious harmony of God's world as it presented itself in its untroubled beauty to the poet's eye.

Taylor Lewis, in his note on Lange's *Commentary*, refers to a passage in Plato's *Timæus*

"so remarkable, that it is no wonder that some should have regarded it as a traditional echo of this old account. At the completion of the

great cosmical ζῶον, the animated universe, with its body and soul (its nature), both of which Plato represents as the works of God, He (God) beholds it moving on in its beautiful constancy, an image of the eternal powers or ideas. At the sight of this, the everlasting Father (ὁ αἰδιος πατήρ) is filled with joy and admiration (εὐφρανθεὶς ἡγάσθη)—the strongest terms to express such an emotion that could be found in the Greek language. There seems too to be implied in both expressions, the Hebrew and the Greek, the emotion of love, and this as it were reciprocal—the kosmos responding and moving on through a principle of attraction rather than of projection or outward mechanical forces.”

He quotes also the κινεῖ ὡς ἐρωμένον of Aristotle (*Metaph.* xi. [xii.] 7), describing the first principle of motion in the heaven, as it proceeds from the first mover. And he justly observes that :

“with all the splendour of Plato’s language in the *Timæus*, there is still lurking about it his besetting inconsistency—the thought of something evil, eternal in itself and inseparable from matter and from nature. It may be said that the great problem of evil seems to haunt some of our best commentators in their exegesis of this passage. They find here an implied reference to future evil. All is *yet* good, they would have it to mean; and so they regard it as a *Verwahrung*, or defence of God against the authorship of evil (see Delitzsch). This mars the glory of the passage. It is simply a burst of admiration and benediction called out by the Creator surveying His works. The anthropomorphism is for us its power and its beauty, which are lessened by any such supposed hint or protestation.”

With this story of creation should be compared more especially Psalm civ., together with Psalms viii. and xix., and many passages in Psalms xxxiii., cxlv., cxlvi., cxlvii., cxlviii. ; Job xxvi., xxxviii., xxxix. ; Prov. viii. 22–31.

CHAPTER II. 1–3.

It was an unfortunate division of chapters which separated these verses from the first chapter, to which they properly belong. The seventh day of rest cannot be separated from the six days of creative labour. They are closely united by the continuance of the narrative with the

simple copula, "And the heaven and the earth were finished."

1. *All the host of them.*—In this passage only is the word "host" applied to the earth; elsewhere it is used of the heavens as denoting either the stars or the angels (1 Kings xxii. 19; Josh. v. 14, 15; cf. Ps. ciii. 21). For "host" of the earth, we find in other places "the earth and the fulness thereof" (Ps. xxiv. 1); or as in Nehemiah ix. 6, "the heaven of heavens, with all their host, the earth and all things that are therein."

2. *Ended*, better "finished." It is the same word as in the previous verse.

On the seventh day. For this the Samaritan, the LXX., and Peshito have "the sixth day," a reading which is found also in the Book of Jubilee and Bereshith Rabba, cap. 9, and which Jerome notices, no doubt a correction intended to avoid the difficulty of supposing that the creative work extended into the seventh day. If God finished His work *on* the seventh day, that day could not have been a day of absolute rest. Others would render the verb in the pluperfect, "On the seventh day God had finished His work"—a very doubtful rendering. Others again take the verb in a somewhat different sense from that which it has in ver. 1, and render, "God came to an end with His work," *i.e.* ceased from it,—a sense which the verb has, though with a different construction, in Exod. xxxiv. 33, 1 Sam. x. 13. But the truth is, the writer merely regards the rest and the completion of the work as one and the same thing.

God rested from His work.—From the word here rendered "rested," lit. *ceased* (from labour), comes our word "sabbath." Words still more expressive of rest are used in Exodus xx. 11 and xxxi. 17, "rested and was *refreshed*," a striking anthropomorphism. Dillmann argues that this seventh day cannot mean the whole period extending inde-

finitely from the original six days of creative activity to the end of the world. God is still working, still upholding all things by the word of His power, still actively engaged in the administration of the world, and therefore not still enjoying His sabbath rest; and he contends therefore that the writer supposes God's sabbath to have intervened between the two periods of creative activity and providential activity, between the original creation of all things and the present ordering and administration of the same. But this does not explain the remarkable circumstance that the seventh day, unlike the six days, has no close; it is not said, "There was evening and there was morning, the seventh day";¹ and the words of our Lord (John v. 17) clearly point the other way. His argument is that good works may be done on the sabbath by man, because God works on His sabbath. (See my notes on ver. 5.) This is the noblest conception of rest, not a dull stagnation, but a happy employment, without effort and without weariness, of all our powers and capacities; as Aristotle finely says: ἡ τελεία εὐδαιμονία θεωρητικὴ τις ἐστὶν ἐνεργεία, "the perfect blessedness is a contemplative energy" (*Ethic. Nic.* x. 8, 7). Such surely is "the sabbath keeping" which remaineth for the people of God (Heb. iv. 9): a rest from wearisome toil, but not from joyous, beneficent occupation.

3. *Blessed the seventh day.* "The perfecting of the work on the seventh day is something positive; namely, that God celebrated His work (kept a holy day of solemn triumph over it), and blessed the sabbath. To *celebrate*, to *bless*, to *consecrate*, is the finishing sabbath-work—a living, active, priestly doing, and not merely a laying aside of action" (Lange).

¹ Dillmann tries to account for this by saying that the sabbath being reckoned from evening to evening, the formula would not be suitable. He forgets that in the case of the other days he has himself argued that the Jewish mode of reckoning the days is not employed here, but the Babylonian, which reckoned from morning to morning.

And sanctified it.—Set it apart for holy uses. It is the same word which is used in both versions of the ten commandments (Exod. xx. 8, 11; Deut. v. 12). In Exodus xx. 11, this the original setting apart of the day is referred to as the ground of the Mosaic institution: “Wherefore Jehovah blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it” (A.V. by an unnecessary change, “hallowed”). Without entering into any discussion of the large and vexed question of sabbatical obligation and observance, it must be admitted that the setting apart and consecrating of a seventh portion of time is part of a Divine order, and has its root in the very constitution of the world. Man can have no higher example than that which is to be found in the Divine nature itself.

EXCURSUS ON THE CREATION OF MAN IN THE IMAGE OF GOD.

WHAT are we to understand by this “image” and “likeness” of God after which man is created? Wherein does it consist? The Greek Fathers, misled probably by the rendering of the LXX.—which by inserting the copula made a distinction between the “image” (*εἰκόν*) and the “likeness” (*ὁμοίωσις*) which as we have seen does not exist in the Hebrew—interpreted the former of the physical being of man, his natural qualities and endowments; and the latter of his moral and spiritual nature, or, rather, of superadded gifts of grace, the original righteousness which was lost by the Fall. Augustine and others of the Fathers following him have developed this notion. Retaining the Aristotelian division of a tripartite nature in man, they hold that the “image” of God is to be sought in the powers of the mind, the memory, the understanding, the will. Even those natural faculties which are to be found in all men have their counterpart in the relations which

subsist between the Persons of the blessed Trinity.¹ But the "likeness" is a kind of perfecting of the "image," a work of grace that crowns and completes nature. Thus the memory is adorned by hope, the understanding by faith, the will by love. Others again make the memory the image of God's power, the mind of His wisdom, the will of His righteousness, etc. There is however no ground for the subtle distinction between the two words "image" and "likeness," or for the doctrinal system which has been built up upon it. But if we are to seek for a trinity in man which shall in any way correspond to, or be an adumbration of, the Divine Trinity, it would be better to say that the image and similitude of God consists (1) in the power of originating, in the power to will, and the power to act, not merely from lower impulse, but with deliberate forethought and adaptation of means to ends, the power which corresponds most nearly, though of course in an infinitely lower degree, to the creative will in God; (2) in the faculty of articulate speech, the utterance of the will, the communication of thought to others, the expression of counsel, purpose, and the like, which answers to the creative word of God, the *λόγος προφορικός*, as distinguished from the *λόγος ἐνδιάθετος*; (3) in the power of influence, subtle, far-reaching, mysterious, inexplicable, but real, corresponding in its measure to that of the eternal Spirit.

Thus it may be said that the image and likeness of God in man is a veritable adumbration of the ever-blessed Trinity; of the creative energy and will of the Father; of

¹ Augustine, *De Trinitate*, lib. x.: "Hæc igitur tria, memoria, intelligentia, voluntas, quoniam non sunt tres vitæ, sed una vita; nec tres mentes, sed una mens: consequenter utique nec tres substantiæ sunt, sed una substantia" (§ 18). In the previous book he had made a different suggestion. He finds there the trinity in man which is God's image to consist in the mind, the knowledge which the mind has of itself, and the love wherewith it loves itself and the knowledge of itself.

the mediating Word, in whom and by whom all things have their being; of the all-encompassing, all-pervading Spirit, whose secret impulses sway human hearts and wills.

Perhaps however this is to refine too much, and Luther may be right when he says, referring to the patristic speculations: "Sicut autem hæ non injucundæ speculationes arguunt acuta et otiosa ingenia, ita minime faciunt ad imaginem Dei recte explicandam." It is perfectly certain that the Hebrews did not suppose this likeness to God to consist in any physical qualities. It is the doctrine of the O.T. as well as of the New that God is a spirit; and, although He may have manifested Himself to men in human or angelic shape, He has no visible form, and cannot and must not be represented by any. "Thou sawest no form or similitude" (Exod. xx. 4; cf. Deut. iv. 12, 15; Isa. xxxi. 3). The image does not, directly at least, denote external appearance; we must look for the resemblance to God chiefly in man's spiritual nature and spiritual endowments, in his freedom of will, in his self-consciousness, in his reasoning power, in his sense of that which is above nature, the good, the true, the eternal; in his conscience, which is the voice of God within him; in his capacity for knowing God and holding communion with Him; in a word, in all that allies him to God, all that raises him above sense and time and merely material considerations, all that distinguishes him from, and elevates him above, the brutes. So the writer of the apocryphal Book of Wisdom says: "God created man to be immortal, and made him an image of His own eternity" (ii. 23).

On the other hand, that this Divine image expresses itself and is seen in man's outward form cannot be denied. In looks, in bearing, in the conscious dignity of rule and dominion, there is a reflection of this Divine image. St. Augustine tries to make out a trinity in the human body, as before in the human mind, which shall correspond in

its measure to the Divine Trinity. Nevertheless he says modestly :

“Let us endeavour to trace in man’s outward form some kind of footstep of the Trinity, not because it is of itself in the same way (as the inward being) the image of God. For the apostle says expressly that it is the inner man that is renewed after the image of Him that created him; and again, ‘Though the outward man perish, yet the inward man is renewed day by day.’ Let us then look as far as it is possible in that which perisheth for a kind of likeness to the Trinity; and if not one more express, at least one that may be more easily discerned. The very term outward man denotes a certain similitude to the inward man.”

Augustine then elaborates the notion of a trinity in man’s body as well as in his mind at considerable length (*De Trin.* xi.). Subsequently however he says that “not only the truth of reason, but the authority of the apostle decides that man is made after the image of God, not in his bodily form, but in his reasonable mind; for it would be a degrading thought to suppose that God is limited and circumscribed by the configuration of bodily members.” And he quotes Ephesians iv. 22, “the new man which is created after God,” and Colossians iii. 9, 10, “the new man which is renewed after the image of Him who created him,” in proof that not in his body, nor in any of his mental faculties, but in the reasonable mind itself, in which he can know God, man is made after the image of Him who created him” (lib. xii. § 12).

But the truth is that we cannot cut man in two. The inward being and the outward have their correspondences and their affinities, and it is of the compound being man, fashioned of the dust of the earth and yet filled with the breath of God, that it is declared that he was created after the image of God. The ground and source of this his prerogative in creation must be sought in the Incarnation. It is this great mystery which lies at the root of man’s being. He is like God, he is created in the image of God,

he is, in St. Paul's words, the "image and glory of God" (1 Cor. xi. 7), because the Son of God took man's nature in the womb of His virgin mother, thereby uniting for ever the manhood and the Godhead in one adorable Person. This was the Divine purpose before the world was, and hence this creation of man was the natural consummation of all God's work.

This image of God is not limited to man's original condition merely as he came first from the hands of his Maker, nor has it been obliterated by the Fall. (In one sense likeness to God seems to have been the consequence of the Fall. "Behold, the man is become as one of Us, to know good and evil," chap. iii. 22.) The statement that man was created in the image of God is repeated when the Elohist narrative is resumed in chap. v. 1, 2, "In the likeness of God made He him," etc., and then we are told in the next verse that Adam begat a son "in his own likeness, after his image"; but that this does not mean that the Divine image is lost and the human image substituted for it, is plain from the statement in ix. 6, where sentence of death is pronounced on the murderer on the very ground that "in the image of God made He man."

The form of expression, "image of God," in the O.T. is confined to the Elohist. The same idea is differently expressed for instance in the eighth Psalm, "Thou hast made him little lower than God"; and there, in the same way as here, there follows the lordship over creation :

"Thou makest him to have dominion over the works of
Thy hands ;

Thou hast put all things under his feet ;

Sheep and oxen all of them, yea, and the beasts of the
field ;

The fowls of heaven, and the fishes of the sea," etc.

The apocryphal writers, the Son of Sirach and the author of the Book of Wisdom, have freely reproduced and com-

mented on the Genesis passage. See Wisdom ii. 23, ix. 1-3; Ecclesiasticus xvii. 1-4. The latter passage especially, "And (the Lord) made them (man) according to His image, and put the fear of man upon all flesh, and gave him dominion over beasts and fowls," is clearly based upon Genesis. In the New Testament there is the same acknowledgement of man's glory and prerogative as made in the image of God. See 1 Corinthians xi. 7 and compare James iii. 9, "men which are made after the similitude of God." Elsewhere however as in Colossians iii. 10, Ephesians iv. 24, St. Paul implies that the image, though not obliterated, has been marred and defaced, and that an inward renewal is necessary, a renewal "in knowledge after the image of Him that created him." So too in the First Epistle to the Corinthians xv., he introduces a contrast between "the image of the earthly" and "the image of the heavenly." The first is evidently, according to his view, the nature derived from Adam (see Gen. v. 3); the second is that of the new nature imparted through Christ and by virtue of union with Him.

It is not a little remarkable that St. Paul in one passage (1 Cor. xi. 7) seems to limit the assertion made in Genesis i. 26, 27, to one sex. According to him apparently, it is not the race, but the man, as distinct from the woman, who is the image of God. Speaking of the public worship of the Church, he says: "For a man indeed ought not to have his head veiled, forasmuch as he is the image and glory of God; but the woman is the glory of the man." St. Augustine sees and deals with the difficulty, which is passed over by too many modern commentators. In Genesis, he remarks, it is human nature itself, which is said to be made in the image of God, which comprises both sexes, and not to the exclusion of the woman. For it is said, "He made him male and female," or, according to another pointing, "male and female made He them."

How is it then, he asks, that the apostle teaches that the man is not to veil his head because he is the image of God, whereas the woman is enjoined to do the contrary? And he argues, that the woman together with her husband is the image of God, and that the whole is one image; but that when she is regarded as occupying her subordinate position as a helpmeet, a position which is hers exclusively, she is not the image of God; whereas the man alone is the image of God as fully and perfectly as he is when united with the woman. And he draws an illustration from the nature of the human mind, which, so long as it is occupied with the absolute contemplation of the truth, is the image of God, but when it turns aside to contemplate inferior objects is not the image of God (*De Trinitate* xii., §§ 9, 10).

Again, quoting Colossians iii. 9, 10: "The new man which is renewed unto the knowledge of God, after the image of Him that created him," he observes that "by this renewal we are also made sons of God by the baptism of Christ and putting on the new man we now put on Christ by faith." Who then, he asks, could refuse to women any share in this blessedness, seeing that they are heirs together with us of grace? For the Apostle says: "Ye are all the sons of God by faith in Christ Jesus. For whosoever of you were baptized in Christ did put on Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither slave nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus."

St. Paul however is not interpreting Genesis, though he seems to be alluding to it; he is only insisting on the relative position of the sexes, especially in the public congregation, and he regards the veil as a symbol of subordination; and he departs in two particulars from the language of Genesis: he does not say that the man is made *in* the image, but that he is the image of God; and, further, he

adds that he is "the glory" of God, a very remarkable addition. In the next clause, when speaking of the woman, he drops all reference to "the image," and merely says that the woman is "the glory" of the man. She is not man's "image," but, like man, was created in the image of God.

J. J. STEWART PEROWNE.

SURVEY OF RECENT ENGLISH LITERATURE ON THE NEW TESTAMENT.

INTRODUCTION.—To Introduction the chief contribution of the last few months is a second volume of the Oxford *Studia Biblica* (Clarendon Press). We are obliged to postpone fuller notice of this collection of papers, and to content ourselves with enumerating those which concern the New Testament. These are, "The Origin and Mutual Relation of the Synoptic Gospels," by Mr. F. H. Woods; "The Day and Year of St. Polycarp's Martyrdom," by Mr. C. H. Turner; "The Clementine Homilies," by Dr. Bigg; "The Evidence of the Early Versions and Patristic Quotations on the Text of the Books of the New Testament," by Mr. Bebb; "The Ammonian Sections, Eusebian Canons, and Harmonizing Tables in the Syriac Tetra-evangelium," by Mr. Gwilliam; and "On the Codex Amiatinus," by Mr. White and Prof. Sanday.

The Bampton Lectures for 1890 were preached by Archdeacon Watkins, of Durham. The subject he chose was *Modern Criticism Considered in its Relation to the Fourth Gospel*. The Lectures are now published by Mr. John Murray. The reader is rather prejudiced against the book by a prefatory note, in which the author's intimacy with Bishop Lightfoot is spoken of in terms lacking in dignity and reserve. But as a record of the criticism of the fourth gospel, not only in modern, but in primitive times, the Lectures are good, and fill a blank in our literature. Probably the judgment of those acquainted with the subject will be that Dr. Watkins has been more successful in arraying the patristic testimony in favour of the gospel than in exhibiting the course of modern criticism. The exhibition of the external testimony in favour of the Johannine authorship during the second century could not be more completely exhibited, and could not easily be

more powerfully pressed home. But indeed it may reasonably be expected that, in presence of the formidable array of external evidence which has driven the date of the gospel back and back to the very verge of the first century, the Johannine authorship must shortly be admitted on all hands. The far more perplexed problem remains behind. Granting the apostolic authorship, how is the representation of Christ in the fourth gospel to be reconciled with that of the Synoptics? If, as in John's narrative, the first disciples immediately after the temptation recognised Jesus as the Messiah, how does this consist with the apparently different representation in the Synoptical gospels? If Jesus spoke as the first three gospels record, is it possible He can also have spoken in the manner of the discourses and discussions reported in the fourth? Now it is quite true that Dr. Watkins does not engage to answer these questions, and we have no right to demand from him more than his title and his aim warrant. At the same time, it was not beyond his function as narrator to bring out more sharply the exact point at which we have arrived, and to show more definitely what criticism has yet to do. His own idea, that "translation" is the magic word which is to solve all difficulties, and bridge the interval between the Synoptics and the fourth gospel may be perfectly correct, but until he much more definitely describes the contents of that word, no one can say whether it suffices or not. In our opinion Schürer, in his recent address on the subject, is more successful in exhibiting with exactness the recent approximation between the two opposing hosts of criticism and in showing what remains to be done. Perhaps Dr. Watkins has not sufficiently remembered the homely proverb that admonishes us not to crow till we are through the wood. No such explanation has yet been given of the differences between the Synoptics and the fourth gospel as commends itself to every one. Criticism has yet before it one of the most difficult problems. But although Dr. Watkins has not done more than he promised, it must not be supposed that what he has done is of little value. On the contrary, he has given us an admirably clear, readable, and fair account of the criticism of the gospel of John, an account which has involved very wide and careful reading. A book of this standing should be clear of all minor blemishes, such as the use of "like" for "as," the spelling of Strassburg with one "s," and one or two stumbles in translation. And is

Oscar Holtzmann so closely related to the greater Heinrich as Dr. Watkins indicates ?

To Dr. Nicoll's "Theological Educator" an excellent book has been added in *The Writers of the New Testament, their Style and Characteristics*, by the late Rev. W. H. Simeox, M.A. (Hodder & Stoughton). A book on this subject was urgently needed; and although Mr. Simeox has given us but a brief manual, it is excellent so far as it goes, and it contains the results of years of study by a diligent and exact scholar. Omissions might easily be pointed out, omissions even of some importance; but the positive contributions made to the characterization of the various New Testament writers are numerous and valuable. Especially does the sanity of the author's critical judgments favourably contrast with the hasty and one-sided opinion which passes in many quarters for brilliant criticism. Of 2 Peter, *e.g.*, Mr. Simeox says: "It may at least be said, on the one hand, that no one can pretend (except on *à priori* theological grounds) to be certain that the second epistle is genuine; on the other, that a superficial student is likelier than a thorough student to be certain that it is spurious." Perhaps the relation of the writings of Luke to the Epistle to the Hebrews taxes the resources and the capacity of the critic as much as any literary problem presented by the New Testament, and in discussing this relation Mr. Simeox appears at his best. But in every part of the small volume do we feel with increasing regret how great a loss we have sustained in the death of this unpretending, sound, and original scholar. More than half the volume is occupied with tables illustrating the affinities between the vocabularies used by the various writers of the New Testament. These tables are original, and should secure for this manual a circulation on the Continent as well as at home. No student of the New Testament should omit to avail himself of the help and stimulus he will find in this handy book.

Under the head of Introduction may be included a volume of some significance, which we owe to the well-known American apologist, Prof. Fisher, of Yale. It is on *The Nature and Method of Revelation*, and is republished in England by Mr. Fisher Unwin. It is a book which most distinctly shows how the wind is blowing. Dr. Fisher has for more than a quarter of a century been recognised, even in orthodox America, as the very type of loyalty to the truth. He has indeed been justly reckoned the doughtiest

champion of revelation and of the Scriptures. But he recognises that the nineteenth century is not the seventeenth, and that, while holding fast to the Scriptures as the normative exposition of Christian doctrine and our guide in matters of faith and duty, the results of biblical science can no longer be ignored. "In these days, no real service is done to the Christian cause by stubbornly adhering to dogmatic prepossessions which have been proved to be untenable, still less by unseemly denunciation of Christian believers who have been led by conscientious inquiry to abandon them." It is Dr. Fisher's attitude towards Scripture, and his denial that inspiration involves inerrancy, that give value to his book at the present time. Had Dr. Fisher been from the first of distinctly liberal or broad tendencies, his recognition of the results of criticism would have little significance; but when we find one of the most trusted and experienced of living apologists frankly yielding old positions, we see that we are passing into new conditions, and must alter our base of defence. Nothing could be more timely than Dr. Fisher's warning to those who unduly push the literal infallibility of Scripture :

"Exaggerated statements on this subject are the occasion at present of two great evils. One mischievous consequence of them is that the truth and Divine origin of Christianity are staked on the literal correctness of even the minutest particulars in the copious narratives of Scripture. The conscientious student, seeing that such views are untenable in the light of fair historical criticism, is virtually bidden to draw the inference that the foundations of the faith are gone. Moreover, some of the most impressive arguments in defence of historical Christianity, which depend on the presence of unessential discrepancies, . . . are precluded from being used whenever the obsolescent theory that the narratives are drawn up with the pedantic accuracy of a notary public is still insisted on."

Dr. Fisher's well written volume should be read by every one who wishes to know the truth about Scripture and to cherish a defensible faith in the Bible.

In connexion with this subject of the attitude of criticism to Scripture in our day, it may be enough to remind our readers of Dr. Dale's recent work, *The Living Christ and the Four Gospels* (Hodder & Stoughton). The strong sense and sagacity of the writer have enabled him to apprehend the only defensible position regarding Scripture. He has, with Luther's fearless confidence in the substance of Scripture, gone back to the Reformation principle, and reasserted it with such clearness and force, that

it may be expected once more to prevail. A more satisfactory grounding of faith, or a truer exposition of the reason of our acceptance of Scripture, there could not be given. No book could be more timely than this, or can more safely be recommended to all serious-minded men.

It is safe to say that during this generation few, if any, scholars have contributed to theological literature work of more permanent and solid worth than the late Bishop Lightfoot. Even while lamenting his loss, we cannot but consider that his influence has only begun, and that the writings he has left us will be read and will be authoritative for centuries to come. In an age when the untiring industry of German critics has reflected some discredit on English theologians, Dr. Lightfoot has surpassed the Germans themselves in original research, in the keenness and finality of his criticism, and in the amount of work done and needing no revision. It was in the department of historical criticism that he was unrivalled; and we cannot but wish that, instead of giving us his commentaries on S. Paul's epistles, admirable as these are, he had completed his edition of Barnabas and Hermas. No doubt, as Bishop Westcott assures us in his prefatory note, Dr. Lightfoot drew a line between these writings and those of Clement, Ignatius, and Polycarp; yet there will always be a feeling that the general title of the five volumes, "The Apostolic Fathers," is rather large for the ground covered. Be that as it may, we have certainly in the two volumes now published by far the best edition of Clement that has yet been issued. Indeed to call this an edition of Clement is to disguise the significance of the volumes. For in point of fact they for the first time determine some of the most troublesome questions of early Church history, such as the succession of the first bishops of Rome, the origin and date of the Muratorian Canon, and the relation of Hippolytus to the Church of Rome and to the writings ascribed to him. So that although a thousand pages may seem a somewhat liberal amount of space to allot to the treatment of one genuine and one spurious letter of the first century, no one who seeks information of a reliable kind regarding one of the most obscure and perplexed periods of history will think he has a page too much. This is not the place to enter into any detailed account or criticism of these volumes; and to praise the wealth of knowledge, the readiness of scholarship, and the soundness of judgment disclosed on every page

would be an impertinence. They will be read and pondered wherever the literature and the history of the early Church are seriously studied. It is interesting to get a glimpse of Lightfoot's method of work, such as Dr. Westcott gives us in his preface.

"When a subject was chosen, he mastered, stored, arranged in his mind all the materials which were available for its complete treatment; but he drew up no systematic notes, and sketched no plan. As soon as the scope of the essay was distinctly conceived, he wrote continuously and rapidly, trusting to his memory for the authorities which he used, and adding them as he went forward, but so that every reference was again carefully verified in proof."

The full title of the present volume is *The Apostolic Fathers. Part I. S. Clement of Rome. A Revised Text with Introductions, Notes, Dissertations, and Translations.* By the late J. B. Lightfoot, D.D., D.C.L., LL.D., Lord Bishop of Durham. The publishers are Messrs. Macmillan & Co.

From the same publishers we have received two other volumes from the pen of the late bishop, published in connexion with the "Lightfoot Fund for the Diocese of Durham." This fund is to consist of all moneys arising from the sale of certain books written by the bishop, and made over to trustees for behoof of the churches and spiritual agencies within the diocese of Durham. Both the volumes we have received are sermons preached in the diocese, and both are such as one might expect to be produced by an overtaxed, but able and well-stored mind. *Leaders in the Northern Church* gives a slight sketch of the founders and promoters of Christianity in Northumberland and Durham, S. Oswald, S. Aidan, S. Cuthbert, and so forth, down to Bishop Butler. There is much here that is interesting, although the sketches are necessarily brief. In the other volume, *Ordination Addresses and Counsels to Clergy*, the intense earnestness and the high spirituality and true consecration of the author are conspicuous. These addresses are not lightly thrown off; on the contrary, the reader feels behind the words the whole man living and striving for the good of his clergy. This spiritual intensity, and a mind moving among the results of a careful study of the New Testament, are the characteristics of this volume, in which there is much that cannot fail to stimulate and to guide those who are entering upon the work of the Christian ministry.

EXEGESIS.—All students of the writings of St. Paul will welcome another volume from Professor Joseph Agar Beet. This volume is *A Commentary on St. Paul's Epistles to the Ephesians, Philippians,*

Colossians, and Philemon (Hodder & Stoughton). The more one uses Mr. Beet's commentaries the deeper becomes the impression that they are sound and thorough work. He is very independent, and consequently excites contradiction here and there; and when he sums up and finally presents his view of Pauline theology, it is pretty certain that many will be found to disagree with him, and to suspect that he has not quite appreciated Paul's sense of entire emancipation from the law. But perhaps even more when we disagree than when we agree with him are we compelled to own that he has not assumed his positions hastily or without knowing how they may be defended. The present volume, although externally it does not sort with the preceding volumes, which is to be regretted, is written on the same lines, and completes a series of commentaries which appeal to a wide circle of readers, and which cannot fail to be found most helpful. Readers of the epistles dealt with by Mr. Beet in this volume may be reminded that Professor Hugues Ultramaré, of Geneva, has commenced a commentary on the same group of letters, and has just issued with Messrs. Fischbacher, of Paris, the first volume of his undertaking. This volume forms in itself a complete commentary on the Epistle to the Colossians.

To the "Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges" (University Press) two volumes have been added during the past few months. One is by Dr. Perowne, Master of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, and it is on the *Epistle to the Galatians*. On this little volume of 120 pages there has been expended labour as conscientious and careful as is often given to very much bulkier books. There is no evidence of haste or scamping in any part of it. The introduction contains all that is needed; the different interpretations have been clearly apprehended and are concisely stated. Everywhere we find the clear statement that results from thorough digestion of the material and clearness of thinking. We could indeed have wished that Dr. Perowne had been a little wider, and a little more Pauline, in his interpretation of the words, "Ye observe days, etc.;" but on the whole his commentary will commend itself, and it quite maintains the high character of the series.

The other new volume of the same series is on *The Revelation of St. John*, and is by the late Rev. W. H. Simcox, M.A. This book of Scripture had for many years strongly attracted Mr.

Simcox, and the present commentary was written more than seven years ago, and has since been revised. Three valuable *excursus* are added, in the last of which a criticism of Vischer's theory is given, as well as a summary of Völter's analysis. The book has thus been brought well up to date. Those who appreciate Mr. Simcox's patient and original work, and who have learned to esteem his combined ingenuity and sobriety of judgment, will believe that the book of Revelation was wisely assigned to him. In his interpretation Mr. Simcox adopts what is known as the "continuously historical" system, finding in the events of the writer's own time a fulfilment, though not the complete fulfilment, which is yet in the future. In every part of the commentary the reader finds himself in the company of a guide who is alive to all the difficulties, and thoroughly on the alert.

Comparable to the Cambridge Series is that which Messrs. Macmillan have commenced. In this new series the text of Westcott and Hort is printed, and a brief commentary added. The present volume is *The Gospel according to St. Luke*, with introduction and notes by Rev. John Bond, M.A. The notes are concise and helpful. But why this bewildering multiplicity of school-books? Had Messrs. Macmillan bought and reprinted Carr's *Notes on Luke*, they would have conferred a still greater boon on teachers.

Round eschatology there accumulates a steadily increasing literature. From one publisher, Mr. Elliot Stock, we receive three contributions. A symposium on *Our Dead: Where are They?* Those who furnish this feast for us are men of name; and yet the main point proved by the volume is, that where the responsibility is so divided no one does his best. *Adam's Duration as Created the Measure of Man's Duration in Punishment*, etc., is a pamphlet apparently by one of the Plymouth Brethren, and is characterized by the fondness for antithesis and merely verbal criticism which so often reveals the lay character of the writings of that body of Christians. The third of Mr. Stock's books comes from the Antipodes, and is introduced to northern readers by Dean Kitchen, as the first work on biblical criticism ever published in Adelaide. It is a translation of and brief commentary on 1 Peter, under the title of *The Letter of the Larger Hope*. The translation is not without merit, but is rather injured by straining after difference from the Authorized Version. The contribution made by the volume is the suggestion

that our Lord's preaching to the spirits in prison is only illustrative of His acts in the life beyond the grave until now, "until all sin and death, which is the consequence of sin, are destroyed." The writer is Mr. John W. Owen, B.A., St. Paul's, Adelaide. From Messrs. Longmans, Green & Co. we receive a volume of more substance than any of these. It is by one who has already successfully dealt with eschatological subjects, Dr. Herbert Mortimer Luckock, and this present volume on *The Intermediate State between Death and Judgment* is a sequel to his book entitled *After Death*. It is learned, cautious, reverential, free from acrimonious polemical matter, and well-written. Dr. Luckock covers much the same ground which has been so judiciously pioneered by Dean Plumptre, but he adduces a considerable amount of new material, especially in the department of patristic testimony. As regards probation after death, Dr. Luckock believes there is ground in Scripture for holding that those to whom salvation has not been offered in this life may in the intermediate state have further opportunity of determining their everlasting destiny; but "for all those whose circumstances are such that the offer of salvation has been fully and adequately presented in this life, probation is limited; and there is nothing in Holy Scripture to induce even a hope that it can ever be extended beyond the grave." Both for information and suggestion, this soberly written and painstaking volume is to be recommended to all who are interested in the intermediate state.

MARCUS DODS.

BREVIA.

Mr. G. A. Smith's "Exposition of Isaiah xl.-lxvi."—This is pre-eminently a time which calls for fairness and tolerance among devout-minded students of the Old Testament. They may be divided into three classes: (1) Those who think that, criticism being of yesterday, and having as yet arrived at no solid results (or almost none), it is unwise for its adepts, even if Christians both in heart and in head, to popularize it; (2) Those who, denying both premisses, and believing that a bold, though not indiscriminatingly bold, policy is also the safest, feel it their duty to communicate the best things that they know to a public which is being sedulously trained to appreciate historical

as well as scientific inquiries; and (3) Those who are slowly feeling their way out of the first class into the second, and speak and act sometimes in character with the one and sometimes with the other. Faithful servants of the Church belong to each of these classes; let them tolerate one another in the fulness of brotherly love, as they are themselves tolerated alike by their common Lord. Let their only rivalry be, who can come nearest to Christ in character and in conduct; and more particularly, as interpreters of the Bible, who can show best how glorious are its truths, and how wonderful the history which is the setting and the verification of those truths. I can imagine that Mr. G. A. Smith's second volume may in some respects give a greater shock to old-fashioned Bible students than the first, because in it he adopts as a "result" of criticism what has either been undreamed of or ignored, if not derided, by most English theologians. In other words, he sympathizes with the second of the above-named classes, though I would not for a moment be thought to imply that he is prepared to adopt a similarly advanced position with regard to other books of the Old Testament. So far as Isaiah goes, Mr. Smith makes a claim upon the indulgence of many of his readers; but let me add that he thoroughly justifies his claim by the fundamentally evangelical character of his theology.

No one can, I think, be in any doubt as to what our author's theological foundation is. The Divine revelation handed on from the past is, to him, continually revealed anew in the present. He believes, not upon the authority of tradition, but on the ground of his experience, that the Person who is attested by tradition, and whose workings in the past criticism does but make more manifest, is as able to save now as in the times of the greatest organs of revelation. "Look at life whole," he says, "and the question you will ask will not be, Can I carry this faith? but, Can this faith carry me?" (p. 187.) True religion is, in a certain sense, independent both of facts and of books; it is a personal "conviction of the character of God, and a resting upon that alone for salvation" (p. 102). The frankness with which Mr. G. A. Smith states this position shows that he has drunk deeply of the spirit of the Reformation. He is not afraid of being thought one-sided. One cannot be always qualifying one's words. There is a time to preach the value of facts; German philosophical extravagances have been recognised as such even in Germany, and should

not be resuscitated in England. There is also a time to insist on the all-importance of personal experience. Even in parts of the Bible—the ultimate source of our tradition—we find recorded a revelation which was “recognised and welcomed by choice souls in the secret of their own spiritual life before it was realized and observed in outward fact” (p. 102). And as the religious value of historical criticism consists in its disclosure of the relative importance of the traditional facts, so that of scientific exegesis is in its illumination of that which is most vital in the articles of our creed, or, to use a phrase of the late Dr. Edersheim, upon “that which is orthodox in orthodoxy.” That this is, in fact, Mr. G. A. Smith’s view will be clear from the following passage :

“Men have always been apt to think of vicarious suffering, and of its function in their salvation, as something above and apart from their moral nature, with a value known only to God, and not calculable in the terms of conscience or of man’s moral experience; nay, rather as something that conflicts with man’s ideas of morality and justice. Whereas both the fact and the virtue of vicarious suffering come upon us all, as these speakers describe the vicarious sufferings of the Servant to have come upon them, as a part of inevitable experience” (p. 354).

To me the example given in this book of the appeal for the binding sense of doctrines to the true meaning of the Scriptures, as elicited by a critical exegesis, seems of much ecclesiastical significance. It shows that such an exegesis can render important service to Protestant evangelical religion, and thereby justifies me in appealing to men of this type of religion to take a more friendly view than they have as yet taken, at least in this country, of the newer criticism. I am far from undervaluing the friendly regard of the younger offshoot of the Anglo-Catholic school; the cause of the Scriptures is dear to me, whoever be its champion. But it does appear to me that the future of Bible-study must in the main rest with those who are not ashamed of the name of Protestant; and, so thinking, I welcome every indication of a diminution of the alarm with which the Evangelical school at first regarded (and not unnaturally regarded) a criticism which began with negations. This is not, however, the only lesson which this book has taught me. My own feeling has been that the cause of healthy progress could best be attained if a kind of “self-denying ordinance” were adopted, alike by those Christian teachers who are hearty converts to critical views, and by those who have

hitherto stood aloof from criticism.¹ I, for instance, as one of the former class, should have been satisfied in my preaching to treat Isaiah xl.–lxvi. as a whole (not merely because this view is supported by most critics, but because it is comparatively easy to make it plausible to beginners), on condition that my own step backwards were accompanied by a corresponding step forwards on the part of some prominent conservatives. Dr. Driver may have had a kindred idea when he assumed the unity of Isaiah xl.–lxvi. in his excellent student's handbook to the book of Isaiah. The fact that Mr. Smith not only does not so limit himself, but sees no need even for excusing his own freedom, suggests to me that the time for compromise may be over, that once more Dean Stanley's farewell Oxford sermon on "Great Opportunities Missed" may have been verified in the history of the Church, so far at least as the Church is represented by her official leaders.²

The "freedom" which Mr. G. A. Smith allows himself may be estimated from the following passage :

"We are therefore justified in coming to the provisional conclusion, that Second Isaiah is not a unity, is so far as it consists of a number of pieces by different men, whom God raised up at different times before, during, and after the Exile, to comfort and exhort amid the shifting circumstance and tempers of His people; but that it is a unity, in so far as these pieces have been gathered together by an editor very soon after the Return from the Exile, in an order as regular, both in point of time and subject, as the somewhat mixed material would permit" (p. 21).

At first sight this view is sufficiently startling. Not only does it destroy the belief in a well-ordered masterpiece of literary style, but it seems to open the door to the most unbridled license of disintegration. It has required the author's utmost skill to make his view plausible to ordinary readers; but his effort appears to

¹ I ventured to propose such a compromise in an article in the *Contemporary Review* for August, 1890, but in vain. One of our *unofficial* Church-leaders will, I am sure, sympathise with my regret—Professor Sanday, who has himself proposed a "self-denying ordinance" (the phrase is his own) for writers on New Testament criticism in *THE EXPOSITOR* for January, 1891. Will the opposing parties (if the word may be used) take notice of his proposition?

² That there has been large excuse for the aloofness of the leaders of the Anglican Church from what is called the higher criticism I willingly admit. And I hasten to add that some of the most honoured members of the episcopal bench have distinctly repudiated any wish to check free but devout investigation. The assumption however is generally made, that investigation is but of yesterday, and that we must therefore "wait." Hence the tacit rejection of my compromise.

have succeeded. An Anglican magazine-writer is so far taken in by surface smoothness as to say that the new commentary on Isaiah by Delitzsch is "perhaps more critical" than Mr. Smith's second volume, though certainly the latter may be described as "more critical than the first," and the two writers, Delitzsch and Mr. Smith, are "the two greatest commentators on Isaiah." This is a gratifying sign of the times. It may safely be said that no surface smoothness of exposition would, ten years ago, have made Mr. Smith's views palatable to such writers. It is only eight years since, in deference to the most competent and sympathetic of advisers (not themselves Old Testament critics) I refrained from introducing such conclusions as Mr. Smith's into my own commentary on Isaiah. Self-suppression could no further go; for the inevitable consequence was that in the recent resumption of the critical analysis of Isaiah xl.-lxvi. my own pioneer-work, summing up my own "provisional conclusions," lies buried and almost unknown in an article in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*. Mr. G. A. Smith indeed does me the justice to refer to this work, but even he does not mention its historical position, in conjunction with my commentary, at the head of a critical movement.¹ When will scholars learn to put the date of publication after each important book to which they refer? Want of knowledge of dates lies at the root of many popular misconceptions. It is however only fair on my part to recognise in the most cordial manner the independent spirit in which Mr. Smith has worked. There may be some who take credit to themselves for having studied some critical question without having consulted their predecessors; a German or a Dutchman must forsooth have an anti-supernaturalistic bias. Our author is not one of these; he honours those who have worked before him. But does his acquaintance with these impair the originality of his views? No; it only opens his eyes to the facts to which, but for those writers, educational prejudices might have blinded him, and to the directions in which a solution of difficulties may possibly be found. And there is the accent of true

¹ Of course, Ewald and Bleek are my predecessors; but no one will say that these eminent scholars give as comprehensive a treatment to the problems of 2 Isaiah as my own article. I have long wished to return to this subject in a work on the present position of the critical and exegetical problems of Isaiah. The apparent simplicity of many parts of Isaiah is due to the conventionality which constantly renews its youth, alike in conservative and in critical theologians, and against which we all need constantly to strive.

humility in the phrase which opens the passage quoted above—"the provisional conclusion." Provisional every statement about antiquity must necessarily be; our means of opening that sealed book are so continually increasing, and yet remain, comparatively speaking, so imperfect, that the most gifted critic and historian must confess the "provisionalness" of his results. But is not this a reason for waiting till "criticism has said its last word"? Some respected Churchmen think so, in the case of the Scriptures; but so Mr. Smith at least does not think. In every book on Israelitish history and literature there must be error; it has not been the will of Providence that biblical scholars should enjoy a fulness of inspiration denied, doubtless for the best of reasons, to the biblical writers themselves. What is inspiration? To Isaiah it was

"nothing more nor less than the possession of certain strong moral and religious convictions, which he felt he owed to the communication of the Spirit of God, and according to which he interpreted, and even dared to foretell, the history of his people and the world" (vol. i., p. 372).

All the inspiration which a biblical scholar can humbly hope to receive is a heightened power of tracing the main outlines of the Divine education of Israel, and the gradual development in Israel of spiritual religion. This gift is conditional on a full recognition of his own limitations by the individual; it is in this as in other fields of divinely appointed work by co-operation that progress is made. Turning to the nine "insertions and appendices" which in 1881 I seemed to myself to have found in Isaiah xl.-lxvi., I find that Mr. Smith for the present holds the following conclusions, in which I can at any rate recognise a sufficient degree of truth to make them worth adoption in public teaching:

1. Isaiah lii. 13-liii. 12. "The style—broken, rolling, and recurrent—is certainly a change from the forward, flowing sentences, . . . and there are a number of words that we find quite new to us. Yet surely both style and words are fully accounted for by the novel and tragic nature of the subject to which the prophet has brought us" (p. 336). In the passage of which this sentence forms part, Mr. Smith's wonderful command of English seems to me to have carried him away. The theory rejected is at any rate put in a most unpalatable form. Dillmann himself, with whom I agree, seems fairer, especially in a sentence near that quoted by Mr. Smith in his footnote on p. 338.

2. Isaiah lvi. 9–lvii. 13a. “Almost none disputes,” says Mr. Smith, “that [this passage] must have been composed before the people left Palestine for exile” (p. 409). The case, as Dillmann perfectly sees, is in the main analogous to that of Isaiah lii. 13, etc. It is even less worth while than in the former case to fight over the degree in which a later prophet manipulated (what need shock us in this word?) the work of a predecessor. Re-editing old writings is no modern or purely western invention.

3. Isaiah lvi. 1–8. This, according to our author, is one of three addresses, “evidently dating from the eve of the Return” (p. 396). A more comprehensive study of the post-Exilic period may some day lead Mr. Smith to doubt the correctness of his impression. There were many afflictions as grievous as that of the Captivity in the long and troublous Persian period, to which, but for Jeremiah xxii. 19–27 (certainly, as I think, a later insertion), its contents would at once be seen to refer it. That “pious souls in many lands had felt the spiritual power of [Israel], and had chosen for Jehovah’s sake to follow its uncertain fortunes” (p. 406), seems to me by no means made out, though I find a similar statement in Dillmann’s note on Isaiah xiv. 1, 2. Certainly the prophetic writer of the latter passage declared, at the close of the Exile, that Israel’s restoration would have the effect of bringing proselytes. But a later prophet knows that this hope has yet to be fulfilled (Zech. ii. 11, viii. 20–23), and Psalm cxxvi. 2 merely says that the heathen recognised the power of Israel’s God to help His people.¹ Nor can I think that the phrase, “to His gathered ones,” in Isaiah lvi. 8, has justice done it by Dillmann’s exposition, “to the remnant of Israel which He will gather.”

4. Isaiah lviii. For various reasons, Mr. Smith thinks it possible to refer this discourse to the Exile, though he sees no reason to assign it, with Ewald, to a younger contemporary of Ezekiel. “Surely,” he says, “there were room and occasion for it in those years which followed the actual deliverance of the Jews by Cyrus, but preceded the restoration of Jerusalem” (p. 415), when the people had to be prepared morally for the great opportunity about to be offered them. It is indeed most sad that we know so little of the religious and social condition of the Jews in Babylonia. We do know that chap. lviii. exactly suits the first century of the

¹ On the fulfilment by Israel of its “missionary purpose,” I may venture to refer to the sixth of my forthcoming *Bampton Lectures* on the Psalms.

Persian period; and if other prophecies become more intelligible by receiving this date, why should we hesitate to do the like in the case of this particular passage?

5. Isaiah lix. "At first sight the most difficult of all of 'Second Isaiah' to assign to a date; for it evidently contains both pre-Exilic and Exilic elements. On the one hand, its charges of guilt imply that the people addressed by it are responsible for civic justice to a degree which could hardly be imputed to the Jews in Babylon. . . . On the other hand, the promises of deliverance read very much as if they were Exilic" (p. 423). The former of these observations is, I think, correct; the latter needs expansion. "Judgment" and "righteousness" are certainly employed in the same way as in 2 Isaiah. But the language of Isaiah lix. 20 favours the view that the transgressions referred to in the earlier part of the chapter have been committed in "Zion," and not in Babylon. In other words, the author writes after the Return, but is acquainted with 2 Isaiah. He may, or may not, have written Isaiah lviii. There is a general affinity between the chapters, which almost requires the supposition of their contemporaneousness, but does not in the same degree require that of a common author.

6. Isaiah lxiii. 1-6. That this is written by the main author of Isaiah xl.-lxvi. is probable, according to Mr. Smith, because theophanies occur at intervals throughout the chapters, and because several of 2 Isaiah's phrases occur in this piece (p. 441). There is an undertone of doubt in this expression of opinion which is not only justifiable in itself, but specially suitable in a popular work like the present. For, in fact, on the determination of the date of lxiii. 1-6 depends that of the period, not only of the preceding and following prophecies, but also of Isaiah xxxiv. 1, on which Mr. Smith expresses himself with much reserve. In reply to Mr. Smith, I will only remark (1) that, if I am not misled by optical illusions, the love of theophanies is characteristic of the whole later period; and (2) that the influence of 2 Isaiah will often account for Isaianic phenomena, as that of Jeremiah does for the Jeremianic phenomena of certain psalms.

7. Isaiah lxiii. 7-lxiv. 12 (11). "It must have been written after the destruction and before the rebuilding of the temple; this is put past all doubt by [the language of lxiii. 18 and lxiv. 10, 11]" (p. 416). This piece of prophetic, or rather of liturgical,

writing is, from a critical point of view, one of the most difficult in our Book of Isaiah. In 1881 I had neither fully taken in all our available information on the Persian period, nor divested myself sufficiently of conservative scruples. There seemed to be two classes of passages in the section, one pointing to an early and another to a late date in the Exile; for the one Isaiah lxiii. 18b, lxiv. 10, 11, and for the other Isaiah lxiii. 18a¹ (illustrated by Isaiah xlii. 14) and lxiv. 5 (if the ordinary explanations of a corrupt text may be accepted). Upon the whole, it then appeared to me that we ought to give the preference to the former class of passages, which indicate that feelings of dismay at the desolation of the temple and of the Jewish cities were still fresh. The expression עֲלֵם בְּחַמַּת עוֹלָם in Isaiah lxiv. 5 (if we may read thus, with Dillmann) does not *necessarily* imply that the Exile had already lasted a long time; this remark may be reasonably justified by מִשְׁאוֹת גְּצִיחַ, in a psalm generally held to be Maccabæan (Ps. lxxiv. 3). A single year of separation from Zion might seem "an age" to pious Israelites; and consequently the period of national independence might be said, as in Isaiah lxiii. 18a, to have lasted "but a little while." But I now see how unlikely it is that a writing which stands among late Exilic and (probably even) post-Exilic writings should be a monument of the early years of the Exile. I was right however in holding it to have been written in Palestine, and I am sorry that Mr. Smith does not support me in this view. Still our new expositor's brief discussion of the subject will be very helpful to English students. The remark that "the man who wrote vers. 11-15 of chap. lxiii. had surely the Return still before him," has in it an element of truth. As our author finely adds, "He would not have written in the way he has done of the Exodus from Egypt unless he had been feeling the need of another exhibition of Divine power of the same kind." It was Psalm lxxxix. which first led me to question the correctness of the view which I had expressed in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*; but only lately have I been able to see my way to a satisfactory date both for the Maschil of Ethan and for the *tefillah* in Isaiah. It was Ewald who, in 1835, first suggested a highly probable date for Psalm lxxxix.; he changed his opinion afterwards, but at that time he referred this and other psalms to the end of the sixth or

¹ I venture for convenience sake to refer to my own commentary, in case Dillmann's may not be at hand.

the early part of the fifth century. Prof. Robertson Smith has since then adopted this or nearly this date for some of the psalms,¹ and Mr. Herford sees the plausibility of explaining Isaiah lxiii. 18 by the troubles of the Jews under Artaxerxes III.² This is, in fact, my own view. The objection is, that there is no evidence of a burning of the temple at this period. How I should meet this objection, I have stated in my *Bampton Lectures*, where this section of Isaiah is repeatedly referred to in connexion with certain psalms (see especially p. 130).

8. Isaiah lxx., which our author (p. 455) regards as Jehovah's answer to the preceding intercessory prayer. "What seems decisive for the Exilic origin of chap. lxx. is, that the possession of Judah and Zion by the seed of Jacob is still implied as future (ver. 9). Moreover the holy land is alluded to by the name common among the exiles in flat Mesopotamia ('my mountains'); and in contrast with the idolatry of which the present generation is guilty, the idolatry of their fathers is characterized as having been 'upon the mountains and upon the hills'; and again the people is charged with 'forgetting my holy mountain,' a phrase reminiscent of Psalm cxxxvii. 4, and more appropriate to a time of exile than when the people were gathered about Zion" (p. 458). It is also remarked that "the practices in ver. 5 are never attributed to the people before the Exile, were all possible in Babylonia, and some are known to have been actual then." If therefore chap. lxiii. 7-lxiv. 12 was written well on in the Exile, why (it is argued) should not chap. lxx., which is "logically connected" with that which goes before, receive the same date? Mr. Smith has condensed his proofs most admirably, but they are not conclusive. His exegesis of ver. 9 seems to me dubious; where is there any reference to the Return from Babylon? Throughout he has perhaps been too much influenced by Dillmann, who will always be consulted with profit, but who is, unhappily, not quite fair to critics of a somewhat different school. I have long ago corrected my own view of Isaiah lxx. 4 ("who eat swine's flesh"), to which I was led by defective information derived from Prof. Sayce.³ But I adhere to my view of ver. 11. Though perfectly

¹ *Encyclopædia Britannica* (art. "Psalms"), xx. 31.

² *The Prophecies of the Captivity (Isa. xl.-lxvi.)*, 1890, on the above passage.

³ Prof. Sayce himself indeed has supplied material for a different view in his *Hubert Lectures* (p. 153). Cf. W. R. Smith, *Religion of the Semites*, p. 272; Hewitt *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, April, 1890, p. 439.

willing to be better instructed, I do not see how Dillmann can assert, "Jedenfalls führt auch dieser Götterdienst [Gad and Meni] nicht aus Babylonien heraus."¹ This great scholar is equally dogmatic on the interpretation of Psalm cxxxvii. 4. Mr. Smith does not offend thus; but it is, I fancy, nothing but a dislike to multiplying post-Exilic psalms which has prompted him to the assertion which he makes. I might say a few things on our author's other allusions to the date of certain psalms, but must in my concluding observations limit myself to Isaiah lxvi., with which Isaiah lxx. is clearly contemporary.

9. Isaiah lxvi. "Whether with the final chapter of our prophecy we at last get footing in the Holy Land is doubtful" (p. 459). Mr. Smith thinks that in lxvi. 1-4 the rebuilding of the temple is "in immediate prospect," while the rest of the chapter has "features that speak more definitely for the period of the Return." These features however, he adds, are not conclusive, their effect being counterbalanced by expressions in vers. 9 and 13. Now I should be most reluctant to dogmatize on either part of Isaiah lxvi. It is not inconceivable that both here and in Isaiah lxx. a later writer may have edited and largely added to an earlier work, or at any rate have introduced passages of an earlier work into his own composition. But upon the whole I am disposed to adhere to the view expressed in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*; and in my Lectures on the Psalms I have endeavoured to add something to the plausibility of my view both of Isaiah lxxiii. 7, etc., and of lxx., lxvi. All this part, in fact, belongs (as probably do Joel and Zech. xiv.) to the troublous times of Artaxerxes II. and III. It is to me a matter of conscience to disburden the great prophet of the Restoration from the imputation of cherishing the morbid and conflicting thoughts which meet us in the last of the appendices to the Book of Isaiah. And here, with much regret to be unable at present to draw attention to its many beauties, I take leave of this necessarily incomplete, but delightful and in the best sense popular, commentary on the greatest of the prophetic books.

T. K. CHEYNE.

¹ On the superstition of the post-Exilic Jews cf. Zech. xiii. 2 (if post-Exilic); Mal. iii. 5; Jos., *Ant.* viii. 2, 5.

JOEL.¹

OUR subject is the Book of the Prophet Joel. You will very soon discover that it is remarkably different from the Book of Hosea. The study of Hosea's writing compelled us to realize all the political, social, religious life of a very great and splendid epoch in the history of Israel. The Book of Joel takes us very largely out of the secular life of men into a region of literary history, and opens up for us theological subjects of study. The book stands in a different order among the minor prophets in the Hebrew text of the Old Testament from the position it occupies in the earliest translation, the translation into Greek called the Septuagint. In the former the order of the first six minor prophets is as we have it in our English Bible; in the latter, it is Hosea, Amos, Micah, Joel, Obadiah, Jonah. These last three books have no statement as to date attached to them; and from the diversity in their position in the Hebrew and in the Greek it is evident that the learned men who put together the Old Testament in Hebrew and the learned men who arranged the Greek translation of it had different views as to the period when these three prophets lived and worked. That means there was no certain tradition about them. The editors had to read and study them, and to form their own conclusion where they should come in. The only thing you can say from the position of Joel in the Hebrew, and also in the Septuagint, is that the old editors apparently believed Joel to be one of the earliest prophets. On the other hand, scholars now-a-days are inclined to think

¹ A lecture.

that Joel was one of the very latest of them. It is quite possible that the position of the book in the collection of minor prophets does not tell us what the old editors thought as to the date of it. In several cases it looks as if they arranged the books, not so much in their chronological order, as in groups; *i.e.* they grouped the books together on account of certain affinities and relationships between those they placed in proximity.

We have, however, to take the book, read it, and form our own conclusion as to the point in Israel's history when Joel lived and prophesied and spoke for God. We know practically nothing about him. His name means "Jehovah is God." We are told the name of Joel's father, but not where Joel was born; nor is it stated when he lived. From his book we can gather with certainty that he prophesied at Jerusalem, and belonged to the Southern kingdom of Judah. From the prominence he gives to sacrifice, to the temple, and to the priest, some critics think he must have been a priest himself. I do not know that there is much in that. The fact is, that beyond his name and that he prophesied at Jerusalem, we know nothing about the man.

I should require to go pretty carefully through the writing, and to give an analysis of it, in order to make you comprehend the larger part of the beauties and significances that are so thickly strewn among its pages; because, if there is a book in the Bible that is a masterpiece of literary art, it is the Book of Joel. There are other prophets who write with greater passion and greater power, who rise to loftier altitudes of Divine revelation; but there is hardly a writer in the Old Testament who shows proof of so careful, and detailed, and exquisite pains to give his work literary polish, finish, and beauty.

As to the style of Joel, in the first half of the book its characteristic is that of a consummate literary artist or

word-painter. He makes pictures to stand out before you by graphic, vivid words, full of colour, full of imagery: pictures that *show* you the things that the man is describing. Then in the second half he suddenly changes his style in great part, and becomes the impassioned orator, rising into a world of wild, lurid imagery, as he pictures to us his conception of the last judgment.

So much for the style. I now go to the contents of the book. It falls into two great divisions. The first of these runs from the beginning on to the end of the seventeenth verse of the second chapter. The second division begins with the eighteenth verse of the second chapter, and travels on to the end of the book. The first half contains a terrible description of disasters, and a foreboding of worse calamities to come. The second half of the book passes on into glorious promises of God's goodness to Israel, and then rises up to a picture of the great judgment of the world.

I will run over the book and give you its subdivisions. For the first chapter you may take as a heading; Present Disasters; Calamities that have Actually Arrived. The second chapter consists of Future Forebodings. The first chapter again divides itself into subsections.

The calamities that have befallen Judæa are the visitation of swarm after swarm of locusts, that are eating up everything in the country. Here is the start. The first paragraph is from vers. 1 to 4. The first verse gives the superscription or the title of the book. Then we read: "Hear this, ye old men, and give ear, all ye inhabitants of the land. Hath this been in your days, or in the days of your fathers?" Do you not feel the literary effect of this? He travels back through the bygone ages to find a parallel to this awful disaster that has fallen on the land, and he can find none in the past. Then he pictures the memory of it travelling down to generation after generation, a horror so terrible as never to be forgotten by mankind.

The literary art with which he instantly makes a tremendous impression of the magnitude of the disaster that is before their eyes is extremely powerful. Here it is: "That which the palmerworm hath left hath the locust eaten; and that which the locust hath left hath the cankerworm eaten." Observe the reiteration: swarm after swarm eating the very heart out of the country until nothing is left.

Then come three pictures, three *tableaux* that rise up to a climax, delineating the ruin that has been wrought. The first idea is that the reign of luxury, of revelry, has come to an end in the land. "Awake, ye drunkards, and weep; and howl, all ye drinkers of wine, because of the sweet wine; for it is cut off from your mouth. For a nation is come up upon my land, strong, and without number; his teeth are the teeth of a lion, and he hath the jaw-teeth of a great lion" (vers. 5, 6). Of course, it is poetical language descriptive of the tiny teeth of myriads and myriads of locust herdes. "He hath laid my vine waste, and barked my fig tree: he hath made it clean bare, and cast it away." That is, the locust has peeled the bark, and left fragments of it, which it has not swallowed, in a ring around the foot of the tree. "The branches thereof stand out white" (ver. 7): a powerful picture of the fruit tree stripped of all its leaves, stripped of its very bark, and standing with its ghastly white arms in the sunlight.

The next paragraph is from vers. 8 to 10, and may be headed: The Consolations of Religion Cut off. "Lament like a virgin"—or bride—"girded with sackcloth for the husband of her youth." It is an exquisite idea; religious worship is depicted as a happy intercourse between God and the one He loves on earth, His chosen people. That is broken off, because the material for sacrifice cannot be found; and so, as it were, no holy breath of human affection goes up to God in heaven, nor answering love from

God comes down. "The meal offering and the drink offering is cut off from the house of the Lord; the priests, the Lord's ministers, mourn. The field is wasted, the land mourneth; for the corn is wasted, the new wine is dried up, the oil languisheth," *i.e.* withereth away.

The next paragraph (vers. 11, 12) may be headed: The Necessaries of Existence, Cut off. That is the climax. Luxury—those who counted on that robbed of it; religion—those who comforted themselves with it robbed of it; then the food of the common people, the prosaic bread and fruit, the very necessities of life, gone! "Be ashamed"—or, be in confusion—"O ye husbandmen, howl, O ye vine-dressers, for the wheat and for the barley. . . . The vine is withered; . . . the pomegranate, the palm tree also, and the apple tree, even all the trees of the field are withered: for joy is withered away from the sons of men." All the land stripped white; leafless, stark, and naked; the whole face of the earth, the vineyards, the gardens, the farms withered. And then that blighted, withered whiteness spreads into the faces of the men who own those gardens and vineyards and farms: the desolation of the country is thus reflected back in the gaunt faces of starving men, until joy is vanished from the homes and haunts of human kind.

The next section (ver. 13 to the end of the chapter) may be headed: The Despair and Distress. "Gird yourselves and lament, ye priests; howl, ye ministers of the altar. . . . Sanctify a fast, call a solemn assembly, . . . and cry unto the Lord, . . . for the day of the Lord is at hand. And as destruction from the Almighty shall it come. Is not the meat cut off before our eyes, yea, joy and gladness from the house of our God? The seeds are rotting under the clods; the garners are laid desolate, the barns are broken down; for the corn is withered. How do the beasts groan! the herds of cattle are perplexed, because

they have no pasture; yea, the flocks of sheep are made desolate. . . . The flame hath burned all the trees of the field. . . . The waterbrooks are dried up, and the fire hath devoured the pastures of the wilderness." A tremendously powerful picture of a famine-stricken country, especially with that feature in it, *viz.* the beasts driven, in their thirst, into delirium, uttering their moans, gasping and groaning in their appeal to God!

We come to the second chapter—Foreboding of Further Ill. In the opening section (vers. 1-3) we first catch sight of the locusts. Once again he pictures the calamity to follow as a fresh invasion of locusts, but he states that as bringing in a day of judgment. God comes with His locust army. "Blow ye the trumpet in Zion, and sound an alarm in My holy mountain; let all the inhabitants of the land tremble: for the day of the Lord cometh"—the day of judgment,—“it is nigh at hand; . . . a day of cloud and thick darkness, like the dawn creeping over the top of the mountain; a great people and a strong, there hath not been ever the like, neither shall be any more after them, even to the years of many generations. A fire devoureth before them; and behind them a flame burneth: the land is as the garden of Eden before them, and behind them a desolate wilderness; yea, and none hath escaped them.”

Travellers and old classic books describe a cloud of locusts, a great, mighty mass of them, as the wind sweeps it along. The sunlight on their yellow wings makes a strange effect through the refraction of light. It is a striking image that Joel gives us—the first glimmer of the early dawn which crosses the tops of the mountains, the gray yellow light in the darkness. To us Londoners the extraordinary effect may be compared to that of a yellow fog. One has described it as “a fall of yellow snow.” Here you note first the appearance of the locusts in the

distance, next their nearer approach, and then the onset. Each paragraph begins with the image of the locusts, the impression they made on men's minds, and ends with the effect actually done by them. In one paragraph the cloud of locusts is as a fire burning before and behind, the country in front like a garden of Eden, and behind a desolate wilderness. The next paragraph describes their nearer approach, as the sound of chariots rattling over the mountain tops—"a strong people set in battle array." At the presence and sight of them the people are "in anguish": all faces grow pale.

You can feel the power of that image—the *sound* of them. You have heard fire in a house, eating, gnawing the timber. The people, at the sight of them, hear that awful, gnawing, devouring sound. Then here, again, it is the effect, of course, on the owners of the country: every face grows white.

The third paragraph, descriptive of their actual onset on the town, is considered one of the finest passages in literature. "They run like mighty men; like warriors they climb the wall; they march every one on his way; they break not their ranks, neither doth one thrust another. . . . They leap upon the city; they run upon the wall; they climb up into the houses; they enter in at the windows like a thief. The earth quaketh before them; the heavens tremble; the sun and the moon are darkened, and the stars withdraw their shining: and the Lord uttereth His voice before His army; for His camp is very great; for He is strong that executeth His word: for the day of the Lord is very great and very terrible; and who can abide it?"

Irresistibly you feel that this is a description of a real locust invasion, with its awful horrors. And yet, at the end of it, behind it, with it, in it, Joel confronts God and the moral judgment of our world.

Then follows the paragraph in which the prophet declares

the possibility of forgiveness (vers. 12-14). "Yet even now, saith the Lord, turn ye unto Me with all your heart, and with fasting, and with weeping, and with mourning: and rend your heart, and not your garments, and turn unto the Lord your God." Observe the tremendous strength of that declaration of God's eagerness to forgive and not punish.

Then comes a paragraph in which the prophet appeals to the people to unite in national contrition (vers. 15, 17).

Now I arrive at the second division, from the 18th verse of the second chapter to the end of the book. Here are the subdivisions of it. First of all (chap. ii. 18-27), Restoration of Prosperity, *i.e.* of material prosperity. Ver. 18 should read, not, "Then *will* the Lord be jealous for the land," *et seq.*, as it is in our old Bible, but "Then *was* the Lord," *et seq.*, as you find it in the R.V.: for it is an historical statement. "Then was the Lord jealous for His land, and had pity on His people. And the Lord answered and said unto His people, Behold, I will send you corn, and wine, and oil, and ye shall be satisfied therewith: and I will no more make you a taunt among the nations, but will remove the invading army of locusts, and drive them into the sea. . . . Ye shall eat in plenty and be satisfied, and shall praise the name of the Lord your God, that hath dealt wondrously with you: and My people shall never be put to shame. And ye shall know that I am in the midst of Israel, and that I am the Lord your God, and there is none else: and My people shall never be put to shame." Mark the termination of that glowing description of mere earthly, bodily plenty and enjoyment.

The next section (vers. 28-32) relates to the outpouring of God's Spirit and the advent of judgment. "And it shall come to pass afterward, that I will pour out My Spirit upon all flesh; and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, your old men shall dream dreams, your young

men shall see visions : and also upon the servants and upon the handmaids in those days will I pour out My Spirit." That was an extraordinary declaration. Hebrew thought recognised that no slave could be God's prophet, because God's prophet must be absolutely at God's disposal ; and therefore that a prophet must be his own owner, a free man. The meaning of that declaration is, that God's Spirit, the full plenitude and Divine revelation of grace and goodness to Israel, shall obliterate all distinctions ; old and young, men and women, children, and slaves even, bond as well as free, shall be filled with God's Spirit. What is the result of that ? "And I will show wonders in the heavens and in the earth, blood, and fire, and pillars of smoke. The sun shall be turned into darkness, and the moon into blood, before the great and terrible day of the Lord come. And it shall come to pass, that whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be delivered : for in Mount Zion and in Jerusalem there shall be those that escape, as the Lord hath said, and among the remnant those whom the Lord doth call."

Those phenomena in nature, those portents to presage the judgment, may not be at all supernatural. Pillars of smoke, great clouds of the black smoke of burning cities in the land, darkening the heavens, the sun and moon shining blood-red through the panoply of smoke—these portents may be merely accompaniments of great human convulsions, terrible devastations of invading armies. But I rather think Joel means more than that ; *viz.* that nature will be moved to its very centre when God treads on it for judgment.

We come now to the third and last chapter—The Guilt of the Heathen (vers. 1–8). Judgment is come. In it penitent Israel is safe. But what of the heathen nations ? "Behold, in those days, and in that time, when I shall bring again the captivity of Judah and Jerusalem, I will

gather all nations, and will bring them down into the valley of Jehoshaphat"—meaning "Jehovah-Judge," the valley where Jehovah sits as judge. "And if ye recompense Me, swiftly and speedily will I return your recompense upon your own head." You know how they took the children of Israel and sold them into distant slavery, because a slave was ever so much more valuable when taken so far away from home that escape was out of the question. That is the Guilt of the Heathen.

Now comes the Judgment of the Heathen (vers. 9-17) in a very powerful passage. "Proclaim ye this among the nations; prepare war: stir up the warriors; let all the men of war draw near, let them come up. Beat your ploughshares into swords, and your pruning-hooks into spears: let the weak say, I am strong. . . . Put ye up the sickle, for the harvest is ripe: come, tread ye; for the winepress is full, the fats overflow; for their wickedness is great." The blood of the grapes gushing out of the winepress is the standing image of carnage and the battle-field. "Multitudes, multitudes in the valley of decision! for the day of judgment is near in the valley of decision. . . . The heavens and the earth shall shake: but the Lord will be . . . a stronghold to the children of Israel. . . . Then shall Jerusalem be holy, and there shall no strangers pass through her any more."

Then, on to the end of the book, we have a picture of the Final Consummation; God's kingdom established, His people dwelling in peace and happiness, and all His enemies discomfited.

There are a number of questions about the prophecy of Joel. Some people think that the book is entirely a prophecy of things future, that from beginning to end it pictures what is going to happen. But the vivid, impassioned feeling with which the prophet describes the devastations of the locusts convinces us that he sees it before him; he lives

in it. There is another idea which ruled in the minds of king James's translators of the Bible; and that is, that the whole of this book of Joel runs on one piece, and the second half simply states the people's desire that God would speak thus comfortably. The objection to that is, that it makes the book one of the weakest and most puerile productions. No Hebrew prophet, in such majestic language and thought, would ascribe to God what he wants Him to say: he knows what God has said, and he declares it in God's name.

Unquestionably the situation pictured in the book is this. The land has been scourged with terrible plagues of locusts, heat, drought, and famine. Joel thinks that worse is coming. Standing there, in the midst of the desolation around him, he sees the threatening future, passes on to the conception of the last judgment, appeals to his own generation to repent, succeeds, and then tells them the changed character of God's intentions to them, now contrite and conformable to the Divine will.

Another group of questions comes up in connexion with locusts. Who can read that book, and not feel that the prophet is describing real locusts? But there are a great many scholars who cannot be content with that idea. They say that these locusts are described as doing things which it is utterly beyond the power of locusts to do, just because they are described by an inspired poet and orator, whose heart and imagination is aroused to preternatural excitement by the horror of his time. But, more than that, they say these locusts represent the devastations of hostile armies. They cannot be symbolical of armies, or else how comes it that, in the second chapter, the poetical description of locusts chooses the *imagery* of an invading army, describing how they assault the wall, spring upon it, and force themselves in anyhow, each marching on his own path? If locusts are symbolical of armies, then how ridiculous to describe a simile in imagery taken from the original!

Another idea is that the locusts are not natural locusts, nor symbols for soldiers of invading armies, but that the whole book is an apocalypse, like the Book of the Revelation in the New Testament, and that "locusts" represent some weird imagery grown out of the morbid mind of an over-excited seer or prophet. But Joel describes what he sees. The locusts are real. Hence that last theory is the most impossible of all.

Let us try to imagine Joel's position, and so travel along the train of thought that produced his splendid prophecy of the coming judgment. First of all, I am confronted with this difficulty, that we who live in this country have no conception of the horror and magnitude of the calamity involved in a locust invasion.

A cloud appears one morning on the horizon. Men's eyes are attracted towards it. All the country around them is a smiling paradise of oliveyards, vineyards, corn crops, rich gardens; the pastures filled with sheep and cattle; men, women, and children fat, ruddy, and well-fed. The cloud draws nearer. It darkens the very skies, spreading out over illimitable space. Presently a terrible yellow glimmer begins to radiate through the sunlight. The inhabitants have all crowded to the ramparts of the town. They look with strained eyes and horror. A whisper begins to go round: It is the locusts, the dreaded locusts. The dark cloud comes on, like a great army swept on by the wind, veering hither and thither as the current changes, not guiding itself, but with that horrible suggestion of being a weapon held by some mysterious hand, controlled by the great power that is behind the elements, the forces, the winds, and the power of nature. For this was the most terrible thing of all in the locust visitation—the sense that they did not choose where they were to go, but were driven by the winds, by God. And so, almost more than anything, more than an invading army launched against the country

by the ambition of a Persian monarch, the locusts were felt to be God's own army of vengeance. Onward the awful horde sweeps, dropping to the ground as it passes on, covering everything, gnawing grass, gnawing the bark of the trees, sweeping branches bare with tremendous rapidity—a slow, unceasing, steady, onward march of that frightful agent of utter consumption, of gnawing desolation, right over the country. Sometimes, when it is a comparatively small horde, it passes over a land, leaving a great riband of desolation, sharp-cut as our London fogs at the edge where the locusts were driven on by the wind, on either side smiling gardens and vineyards.

An additional horror about locusts was this. Nothing could stop them; nothing could destroy them. Ditches might be dug and filled with them; still on they come, on they come, out of the hot wilderness of Arabia, swarm after swarm. Not merely food in its season, but young corn just springing is also destroyed; the seed for next year is destroyed; sheep, cattle, horses are deprived of their sustenance and perish of hunger. Into the gardens the invading hosts make their way. Everything they eat up, even the food stored for the winter. A visitation of locusts is not like a blight of fly that comes and destroys part of our flowers, or part of our turnip crop, or potatoes. It means famine; gaunt, horrible, cruel famine, gnawing at the very vitals of men. It means men and women going about with blue lips, holding in their laps their dying children; the animals emaciated, mad with agony, dropping to die everywhere. The locusts after a time die too, creating a horrible stench; and that coming upon depreciated health and an emaciated population, produces pestilence. A descent of locusts on a whole country, repeated month after month, threatens its people with actual extermination.

Who can resist the conviction that Joel stood in a land that had been scourged in that fashion? The very power

with which he pictures the horrors of such a situation carries conviction. All sounds of revelry, the merry song of the drunkards, the laughter, and jests, and huzzas in the houses, dead and gone; silence all over the land; at the very temple, no longer the smoke of the sacrifice is seen curling up to God in heaven—the very breath of communication between heaven and men stopped; the land lying under a religious ban, severed and cut off from God; the necessities of existence reduced to the last degree of attenuation; actual hunger, deathly starvation, confronting men; beasts, men, women, everywhere perishing for want of food, for want of water; and a horrible heat adding its horrors to the hunger and the desolation.

Remember the supernatural way in which God makes men prophets. It stands true to human experience that calamity like that stirs the depths of man's nature. Your materialist is shaken out of his materialism. Confronted with these uncontrollable, awful powers of nature, wielded so strangely—with the horrors, the reproaches, the accusations of an evil conscience backing up the dark forebodings and dreads, men begin to think of that world that lies behind and beneath this outer earth of ours. They recognise the moral forces—the forces of justice; the forces of goodness; the forces of evil; the forces of righteousness, of retribution; the great God over our world controlling it. When an awful flood occurs, as when a great reservoir bursts, or a mighty river overflows its banks, that is always felt to be a visitation of God; or an earthquake, when the solid earth heaves and trembles beneath their feet, then men feel that this world is in the hand of Almighty God.

Joel, to whom God was a reality; Joel, a man whose conscience, whose soul, had been rent with pain and agony because of the recreant worldliness of Israel, living in sensuality and self-indulgence;—Joel looks on this visitation, blow after blow struck, and feels in it the hand

of God. It is not locusts we have now to do with: it is God Himself. Then there is this strange instinct in human nature. We feel that all God's judgment on earth grows out of one element, one attribute of the Divine character; it is all of a piece. Every blow struck against the world's evil, every disaster launched by the Almighty hand against sinful men, is but the first blow of the great final judgment. In every great pestilence, in every great famine, in ages when the world has been convulsed by great wars, men have always been stirred by the tremendous thought of the last judgment. And so Joel, looking out, and seeing still more terrible swarms of locusts coming, carrying with them utter, final destruction, has his soul stirred within him; he hears God's voice, hears Jehovah marching at the head of the host of retributive ministers, and sees at the very threshold of his age the advent of final judgment.

And then, like every Hebrew prophet who feels that, bad as God's people may be, and utterly foolish, yet for an absolute certainty God has lived, wrought, and achieved great things among them—who knows that God has given them a revelation that might be the world's blessing, that God has laid the foundation stones of a heavenly kingdom on earth—Joel, with all that faith in his soul, knows the judgment must be averted, that God cannot mean the annihilation of His people, the thwarting and breaking of His own Divine purposes. And so, suddenly, Joel turns to the people, terrified by his awful, lurid pictures of the coming doom; and he declares to them, "Yet God is ready to forgive."

Ah! when judgment is actually begun, He will still draw back; He will pardon to the uttermost, if men will but repent, and obey Him. It is a striking doctrine, that. God repent! God change! Is not God eternal, sovereign, immutable in His will? Yes, so He is. But

the law, as the Bible teaches us, from the first page to the last, is that God changes every instrument towards us, as our attitude changes towards Him. Until the mercy of Omnipotence is exhausted, God will not suffer any creature He made to be lost: nothing but hopeless, persistent, irreclaimable impenitence can bring final judgment.

Another thing about the law of Old Testament prophecy is that prophecy is conditional, unless it be expressly stated to be absolute. Up to this point Joel has come. Suddenly, when the people repent, he says, "It is all gone." There is a fine remark made by Jerome: "It does not follow, because a prophet has foretold a calamity, that therefore that calamity shall come to pass; for God's prophets do not foretell calamity in order that it may come to pass, but *in order* that God may be able to withhold it." That is the gospel conception of prophecy.

The people are penitent. Instantly Joel declares to them that God's attitude to them is altered; and when they do repent, the first thing promised them is a superabundance of earthly and material prosperity. There are men who say that this is a degrading thing in Joel's prophecy, and they make a similar charge in regard to other parts of the Old Testament. Degrading? Not a bit of it. I call it a fine thing that those Old Testament prophets did believe, with a tremendous conviction, that all earthly mercies come from the love of God. This is the doctrine we need to have preached if we really desire to have the love of God in our religion, in our real life, and not in unreal life, *i.e.* life artificially put on when we get into an ecclesiastical building. It would have been a degrading thing if Joel had begun with earthly prosperity and ended with earthly prosperity.

But what is the crowning climax and joy in that restored prosperity? It is the proof to Israel that God is with them once again. With them again, for what? To pet, and

spoil, and pamper them? No; to make them able to do their duty. That is a grand thing. What does material prosperity do to you? Does it make you selfish, indolent? To Joel and to the penitent people that were at his back, that outpouring of prosperity woke them to a sense of neglected duty. Ah! they understood God's design in Israel was not merely to have them surfeited with food and drink. God has an ethical, a religious purpose in view; for His people shall be made fit to accomplish His Divine purpose in the world's history. But Joel and the people felt that Israel needed something grander than that penitence of theirs in order to fulfil in this world all that was in God's heart. Israel must be transformed, sanctified, made perfectly conformable to the heart, and mind, and will of God. That, Israel could never do for itself; that must come down from heaven; that must be the gift of God. And so the prophet passes on to declare how, after Israel is restored, God will pour out His Spirit, fill every man and woman in the land with His own desires, His own impulses, His righteousness, His holiness, His truth, His goodness, His longings for the kingdom of heaven on earth.

The outpouring of the Spirit, what shall follow that? Judgment. The outpouring of the Spirit is the precursor of judgment. Is that not a startling transition? Not at all. As soon as God's people have been divinely fitted to accomplish their task, as soon as God's servants are prepared completely to achieve His kingdom on earth, then the end of all things is at hand. The plenitude of the Spirit put into the Church means the *finale* of our world's history. In the *dénouement*, those who call on the name of Jehovah, and those whom Jehovah calls to be His own, pass through it unscathed and saved. The terrors, the retributive forces of judgment, fall now upon those who have remained persistently hostile to God and to God's kingdom.

That last chapter has in it some things that jar upon

our Christian instincts. There is a certain vengeful delight in the thought of the destruction of Philistia, Phœnicia, and those other nations that have so harried Israel in the olden time. What of that? Why, that just means that the Old Testament has not in it the perfect sweetness, the fulness of Divine love revealed in Jesus Christ. And have we Christians got it?

I grant you this: a mechanical, an artificial, dead doctrine of Bible inspiration makes that into a difficulty; but a real, living recognition of the inspiring Spirit of God in those old prophets, in those actual messages of theirs, involves no difficulty whatever. But to the men who raise difficulties of that sort, who bring such reproaches against Old Testament prophets, I will make answer thus: Never mind the mixture of personal anger in it. Mark what Joel believed and comprehended! Mark the grandeur of that belief! To him this world was not a great congress of physical forces, of vegetable life, of animal life, where the nations were left to welter in their hostilities and ambitions, where every man had nothing higher to do than to grasp as much as he could of earth for his own selfish advantage. To Joel this world is a great drama; the history of humanity is a tragedy; this world is ruled and controlled by a holy, righteous God; this world exists for the production of ethical, religious, eternal character; this world is being sculptured into a kingdom of holiness, righteousness, truth, goodness, and love. I do not care how many defects and ignorances there are, I do not care how much of weak personal feeling mingles in Joel's declaration of that faith; but I tell you what it is: All that is grand, and great, and heroic, and good in our world has grown out of faith in man's soul, often dark and obscure and ignorant—faith that this world belongs to God, is ruled by God, and shall at last be judged by God. Oh! a faith like that in a real God, a God that cares whether

we serve Him, or whether we do not; a God that will take the trouble to reckon with us, and with our age, and with all the ages, and with this world of ours at last—that is a faith that lifts a man above himself, up above the world, and that stirs him to chivalrous and glorious achievements; a faith that builds up the great realm of ethical glory and grandeur, of religious aspiration, and hope, and love; the finest outcome of our world's struggle, and trial, and battle.

W. G. ELMSLIE.

A SURVEY OF THE SYNOPTIC QUESTION.

II. POINTS PROVED OR PROBABLE.

ONE respected critic assures us that there is no such thing as a "Synoptic theory," only "a Synoptic craze."¹ Perhaps; but at any rate the epidemic is so widespread that those who are bitten by it can keep each other in countenance. We saw last month how four (or rather five) independent inquirers, approaching the subject under very different conditions, all after study more or less close, and some after study very close indeed, not only shared the belief that there is a Synoptic theory, but agreed in adopting what in its main outlines is virtually the same theory. They agreed in postulating two fundamental documents as the groundwork of the common matter in the three Gospels.

I said however that the theory thus framed fell into several distinct parts, and I undertook to attempt to define the extent to which each of these parts might be considered

¹ Rev. E. S. Ffoulkes, in a collection of four sermons, entitled, *The New Criticism*, p. 14. (London, 1890.)

to be established. My object is at once to help the formation of opinion generally, and in particular to indicate to those who are willing to work at the subject the directions in which I think that they may do so with most profit.

Utterances such as that to which I have just referred prevent me from speaking quite so objectively as I might have been otherwise tempted to do. I cannot lay down what is as a matter of fact and by general consent. I can only express my own opinion, which must be taken for what it is worth. With this reserve I will take separately each of the two hypothetical documents in question, and will draw out certain propositions in regard to them which appear to me to be either proved or probable, or at least fit subjects for discussion.

Beginning then with the first document about which the case seems to be clearest. I believe it to be practically proved (1) that there is such a fundamental document; (2) that it is represented most nearly by the Gospel which bears the name of St. Mark. I believe it to be also highly probable and on the verge of proof, (3) that the common foundation of the three Gospels was a document strictly so called, written and not oral. Lastly, I think that the exact relation of this document to our present St. Mark must be regarded as still an open question, which has made some way towards solution, but is not yet solved.

On the first three of these propositions I should be glad to quote a passage from Mr. Estlin Carpenter. He says:

“ We may assume . . . that the verbal coincidences [between the Gospels] are due to one of two causes: either the Gospel which was produced first was employed by the authors of the other two, or all three Gospels were based upon some common sources. This latter view seems best to meet the conditions of the case. Whether these common sources were still unfixed in writing, and were only passed from one to another in oral teaching, or whether they had already been invested with some primitive literary form, is open to question. It is perhaps more important to inquire which of our present Gospels seems

to stand nearest to them in order of time. The answer, which is given with increasing clearness and decision by scholars approaching the problem along very different lines, finds the earliest of our three in 'the Gospel according to S. Mark.'"¹

For "nearness in order of time," I should be inclined to substitute "nearness in substantial reproduction," as that will complicate the statement less with any questions which might arise as to editorial redaction and a possible interval between the earliest form of the Gospel and the form in which it has come down to us. In other respects I should entirely endorse what Mr. Carpenter has said as to the "increasing clearness and decision" with which the so called "priority of St. Mark" is being asserted.

Mr. Carpenter takes the side of caution in allowing for the possibility that the fundamental tradition embodied in our three Gospels was oral and not in writing. He is certainly justified in this, so long as writers of the importance of Dr. Westcott and M. Godet still hold out. There is however no doubt that the great preponderance of opinion at the present time is in favour of a written document; and it seems to me, I confess, that the case has been sufficiently made out. This side of the question has been recently reinforced (1) by the very careful and elaborate essay, by Mr. F. H. Woods, on the "Order of the Synoptic Narratives" in the second volume of *Studia Biblica*;² and (2) by an able argument, not exactly directed to this point, but really applicable to it, by Dr. Paul Ewald.

If the common tradition incorporated in the first three Gospels was transmitted orally the whole of the way until it took the shape in which we now have it, then it follows

¹ *The Synoptic Gospels*, p. 261 f.

² I leave this as it was written, though I fear that it does not do justice to an admirable piece of work, which should have had a more conspicuous place in these papers. It has been less present to my own mind, chiefly because the point with which it deals is one as to which I have long been convinced. But upon that point I believe that it will retain a permanent and even classical value.

that that tradition must have been peculiarly stereotyped in form. The followers of Gieseler have always held that it was so stereotyped. They go on the assumption that in the mother Church at Jerusalem a process went on similar to that which Mr. Wright describes in regard to the catechists,¹ though perhaps somewhat less attached to particular names. The degree of fixity in the tradition thus moulded must have been very considerable to account for the close resemblance which the Gospels present in regard at once to the incidents selected for narration, to the order of the narratives, and to the language in which the stories are told. Now admitting that this degree of fixity was possible; admitting that, although contrary to modern experience, it might yet be accounted for by the peculiar habits of the Jews and the comparative centralization of the primitive Church—it still remains to ask whether we have any evidence that the tradition handed down by the apostles at Jerusalem was actually of this nature.

A doubt on this head may be raised by the actual phenomena of our present Gospels. True, the groundwork of the tradition is remarkably fixed; but when we come to look at it, we see, alongside with this fixed groundwork, a quantity of other matter by no means so determinate. Each of the three Gospels, especially the first and third, contains over and above the common tradition a number of other incidents, a number of other sayings and discourses, which are not found in the rest. Whence did these peculiar sections come? Did not they too circulate in the Church at Jerusalem? If they did, as some of them we cannot help thinking must have done, then the tradition of the mother Church must have been less stereotyped than we suppose. The common groundwork of our three Gospels is not an adequate representation of it.

¹ See the passage quoted in the last number of *THE EXPOSITOR*, pp. 83, 84.

Here is the point at which Professor Ewald comes in with an argument which, I confess, appears to me to be of great force. He is not content with the common isolation of the Synoptic Gospels, and he boldly extends his appeal to the fourth Gospel. Where, he asks, was the special type of tradition which stands out so distinctly there? Those of us who believe in the genuineness of that Gospel would find it hard to answer him without admitting that the so called "triple tradition" is far from containing all that the original apostolic tradition contained.

But Dr. Ewald very rightly does not merely go upon the ground of an assumption. He asserts indeed emphatically the genuineness of the fourth Gospel, but at the same time he marshals the evidence which goes to show that, whether it be genuine or not, a tradition like that which it contains was actually current in apostolic times and among the apostolic circle. The Synoptics themselves, he shows, in many respects imply what is not told by themselves, but by St. John. The other New Testament literature implies it. Even in the Epistle of St. James, for instance, Dr. Ewald finds Johannean reminiscences, not tracing them to the Gospel, but to the discourses recorded in the Gospel. Thus St. James i. 18: "Of His own will He begat us (brought us to birth) with the word of truth." Dr. Ewald refers to the discourse with Nicodemus (St. John iii. 3). We might compare also the comment of the evangelist in St. John i. 13: "Which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." The combination of these two ideas, the Divine will and the process of spiritual generation, is hardly an obvious one. Parallels should be sought for outside the New Testament to determine how far the idea was current. Then again, "The truth shall set you free" (St. John viii. 32) is compared with "the perfect law of liberty" (St. James i. 25); "shall save a soul from death" (St. James v.

20), with "is passed from death unto life" (St. John v. 24). No one would say that the link of connexion between these passages is undeniable. We must not speak hastily until the apocryphal literature has been more fully examined; but there is enough to make us pause and consider, especially when we remember how deeply figurative all this language is and how the figures have to be coined.

But if there are these coincidences—or what seem such—with a writer so unpromising as St. James, it is easier to find them with St. Peter and St. Paul. I must not delay over this part of the argument, but simply refer the reader to Dr. Ewald's "First Excursus." Let it be borne in mind that there are three possible hypotheses: the hypothesis of accidental coincidence of idea; the hypothesis of direct literary influence by the earliest writer (whichever he was) upon the later; and the hypothesis of a common source, which it is most natural to seek in the words of Christ. Our duty is to accept whichever of these hypotheses fits the facts best. That however is a point which will not be reached for some time to come.

From the New Testament Dr. Ewald passes to the extra-canonical literature. Now here I think that he has a clearer case. It is admitted on all hands that there are Johannean touches and turns of phrase in the sub-apostolic writers, Clement, Barnabas, Ignatius, and in the *Didaché*. It has been sometimes contended that these coincidences proved the use of the Gospel. That, I think, is rightly denied. They do not prove the use of the Gospel; but they do prove that there was floating about the Christian Churches a Johannean cycle of tradition as well as a Synoptic cycle. I will take an example which is not treated in detail by Dr. Ewald, but with which I have been much impressed since its first discovery. I refer to the *Didaché*. The eucharistic prayer in chaps. ix., x. is evidently something more than the composition of an individual: it

represents thoughts and expressions which must have had a certain amount of general currency. But read the following :¹

DIDACHE, chaps. ix., x.

We give thanks to Thee, our Father, for the holy vine of David, Thy servant,^a which Thou hast made known (ἐγνώρισας)^b to us through Jesus Thy servant.

As this broken bread (κλάσμα) was scattered (δισκορπισμένον)^c upon the mountains, and gathered together became one, so let Thy Church be gathered together from the ends of the earth into Thy kingdom.

We thank Thee, holy Father,^d for Thy holy name which Thou hast caused to dwell (tabernacle) in our hearts^e (Εὐχαριστοῦμέν σοι, Πάτερ ἅγιε, ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἁγίου ὀνόματός σου ὃ κατέσκηνωσας ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν [edd., ὑμῶν, Cod.]), and for the knowledge and faith and immortality^f which Thou hast made known to us through Jesus Thy Servant: to Thee be the glory for ever.

To us Thou didst freely give spiritual food and drink and eternal life^g through Thy Servant.

Remember, O Lord, Thy Church, to deliver her from all evil,^h and to perfect her in Thy loveⁱ (τοῦ ῥύσασθαι αὐτήν ἀπὸ παντὸς πονηροῦ, καὶ τελειῶσαι αὐτήν ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ σου).

^a Cf. St. John xv. 1 f. The reference to Christ rather than the Church is made highly probable by the parallel in Clement of Alexandria, *Quis div. salv.* 29: οὗτος ὁ τὸν οἶνον, τὸ αἷμα τῆς ἀμπέλου τῆς Δαβίδ, ἐκχέας ἡμῖν. [I owe to friends, (i.) a reference to Delitzsch, *Iris*, p. 185 Eng. trans., where the Targum on Ps. lxxx. 15, 16 is quoted as proving that Vine=Messiah; (ii.) the suggestion that here, as in St. John xv., the ideas of the Church and its Head are closely connected.]

^b Cf. St. John xv. 15, xvii. 26, though it is rather too much to say with Harnack, "Dies feierliche γνωρίζειν ist nur Johanneisch."

^c Cf. St. John xi. 52: ἵνα καὶ τὰ τέκνα τοῦ Θεοῦ τὰ δισκορπισμένα συναγάγῃ εἰς ἓν.

^d Only in St. John xvii. 11.

^e Cf. esp. St. John xvii. 11, 12 (in the corrected text): Πάτερ ἅγιε, τήρησον αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου, ὃ δέδωκάς μοι, κ.τ.λ. κατασκηνώω is also a Johannean word.

^f This conjunction of "knowledge, faith, and immortality" is noted as Johannean (cf. St. John vi. 69, 70; x. 12, 38, etc.), the only difference being that St. John's phrase is not ἀθανασία, but ζωὴ αἰώνιος.

^g πνευματικὴν τροφήν καὶ ποτόν is perhaps more Pauline than Johannean; but ζωὴν αἰώνιον carries us back on to Johannean ground, and the thought is just that of St. John vi. 27, 32-35, 47-58.

^h Cf. St. John xvii. 15.

ⁱ Cf. 1 John ii. 5; iv. 12, 18.

¹ I check my own impressions by the use of Harnack, *Texte und Untersuch.* ii. 79 ff., and Wohlenberg, *Die Lehre der zwölf Apostel in ihrem Verhältniss zum neutestl. Schrifttum*, p. 56 ff.

This last phrase (*τελειῶσαι ἐν ἀγάπῃ*) is especially remarkable, and it seems to me, taken with what has gone before, convincingly to prove the acquaintance of the author of the *Didaché* with that branch of the evangelical tradition which is preserved most distinctly in St. John. But what holds good for the *Didaché* holds good also in greater or less degree for all the apostolic Fathers; one might almost say, for all the extant Christian literature outside the New Testament up to and including Justin.

To maintain this however is little more than an outwork of Dr. Ewald's position. Behind this he has a second line more formidable still. I wrote myself¹ some little time ago as follows:

"The advocates of oral tradition invariably and naturally look to Jerusalem as the home of that tradition. Is it not then strange that it should say so little about the work of our Lord at Jerusalem? Here is a tradition which is supposed to have been formed and circulated for some forty years at Jerusalem, and yet its contents are almost entirely taken up, not with those visits to Jerusalem of which St. John has so much to say, but with the ministry in Galilee. Are these two things easily reconciled? It does not seem so."

Of an argument like this Dr. Ewald makes most effective use. Once more he does not assume what an opponent cannot be expected to grant. He takes his stand, not upon the genuineness of the fourth Gospel, but upon general historical probability. The more reasonable of those who refuse to identify the author of the Gospel with St. John still allow that he was right in laying so much of the scene of our Lord's ministry in Judæa and Jerusalem. If it was true that a prophet could not "perish out of Jerusalem" (St. Luke xiii. 33); if it was true that Jerusalem was the true home of the prophets, which made it all the more remarkable that the Messiah was without honour there (St. John iv. 44); if the lament over Jerusalem speaks of the

¹ In a popular introduction not yet published.

many times when He would have gathered His little ones together there,—then we may be sure that those opportunities really were given, that the last passover was not the only feast which saw the presence of Jesus in its streets, that the household at Bethany was not the only one that had listened to and accepted His teaching, that there was more than one “upper room” in the city itself in which He would have been welcome.

But once assume this—assume that there was a Judæan ministry as well as a Galilæan, and we have to find an explanation for the fact that the Synoptic Gospels record only the latter. How can we explain it if the tradition which they record grew up in the heart of the city which it so strangely neglected? How can we explain it if St. John was one of those who helped to form the tradition?

The truth is, that we must give up the idea that the Synoptic Gospels represent a central tradition at all. There is, as Dr. Ewald says, something one-sided about them; and thus the problem is, How did that one-sidedness get there? A satisfactory answer cannot be given so long as they are regarded as a product of the Church working collectively. The stamp which they bear is not collective, but individual; the tradition which they represent is not central, but sectional. The solution is indeed not far to seek. We are brought back once more to the express statement of Papias. Notes by St. Mark of the preaching of St. Peter give us the essentials of what we want. What the whole Church could not omit, what the whole body of the apostles could not omit, that a single apostle—not sitting down deliberately to write history, but merely from time to time choosing his subjects for edification—might very well fail to mention.

We have seen that the theory which bases our present Gospels directly upon oral tradition is bound up with the hypothesis that that tradition was formed in the bosom of

the apostolic college at Jerusalem. A blow therefore that is struck at that hypothesis tells also against the theory which it supports; and coming as it does on the top of so many other serious difficulties in the oral theory, it may, I think, be taken as practically disposing of it. We do not exclude oral tradition by any means; it is quite possible that some sections in our present Gospels may be due to it: but to take it as the main factor in accounting for the phenomena of the Gospels as we have them seems to me untenable. If we wish to look for a specimen of the working of oral tradition—not in the first or apostolic generation, but at a later date, in the period which is called sub-apostolic—we may see it in the various readings of a group of very early authorities, at the head of which is that notoriously eccentric MS. Codex Bezae (D).¹

For those of us who are constrained to seek for the foundation of our Gospels in a written document, two questions will remain in regard to that document: (1) What was its extent? (2) What was its composition?

We have already seen that the fundamental document approached most nearly in its character to our present St. Mark. The question therefore as to its extent is really a question as to its relation to our St. Mark. Was it identical with it? Was it co-extensive with it? If not co-extensive, was it longer or shorter?

The view that there was an original Gospel like our St. Mark, but not exactly to be identified with it, is one of those niceties of criticism which cannot be expected to commend themselves at once to the lay mind. It is based on the fact, that although, when our St. Mark is compared with the other two Synoptics, in by far the majority of cases it presents a form of the narrative which approves itself as older or more original, there still remains a minor-

¹ For other possible explanations of these readings see the fourth paper in this series.

ity of instances where this is not the case, and where the preference has rather to be given to one or both of the other Gospels. One of the criteria by which we establish the priority of St. Mark is its constant agreement with one of the companion Gospels against the other. This applies both to the order of the narratives and to the language in which they are told. So far as the order is concerned, I believe that there is no true exception. There are a few cases where all three Gospels diverge from each other: but, as a rule, if St. Matthew deserts St. Mark, St. Luke agrees with him; and if St. Luke deserts St. Mark, St. Matthew agrees with him. There is no case in which the order of a section common to all three is supported by St. Matthew and St. Luke against St. Mark. On the whole, what is true of the order of the narratives is true also of their language. Here too St. Mark is the meeting-ground. If we take the sections common to the three evangelists, there is a vast number of expressions in which St. Mark coincides with one or other of his fellows against the third. Rather more often he coincides with St. Matthew against St. Luke; but the instances are also very numerous in which he coincides with St. Luke against St. Matthew. On the strength of this phenomenon, we say that he is *prior* to both.

But here the facts are not quite so uniform as they are in regard to the order. The rule is certainly a rule which has the immense preponderance of instances in its favour throughout the Gospel. Still it is not without exceptions. Let us take one of the first sections we come to, the two verses which are all St. Mark gives to the temptation. I place the three columns side by side, representing the points common to St. Mark with St. Matthew against St. Luke and with St. Luke against St. Matthew by italics, and those common to St. Matthew and St. Luke against St. Mark by small capitals.

ST. MATTHEW iv. 1, 2.

“Then was JESUS LED up of the Spirit *into* the wilderness to be tempted of the DEVIL. And when He had fasted forty days and forty nights, HE afterward HUNGERED.”

ST. MARK i. 12, 13.

“And straightway the Spirit driveth Him forth *into* the wilderness. And He was *in* the wilderness forty days, *being* tempted of Satan; and He was with the wild beasts; and the angels ministered unto Him.”

ST. LUKE iv. 1, 2.

“And JESUS, full of the Holy Spirit, returned from the Jordan, and was LED by the Spirit *in* the wilderness during forty days, *being* tempted of the DEVIL. And He did eat nothing in those days: and when they were completed, HE HUNGERED.”

There are some noticeable things in this passage, though it does not quite fairly represent the relation ordinarily subsisting between the three Gospels; the amount of variation is rather greater than usual. Yet even here there are small points which are significant. It will be observed that St. Mark has the double expression, “into the wilderness,” and “in the wilderness.” St. Matthew has the one, St. Luke has the other. Again, both St. Mark and St. Luke have the expression “being tempted,” implying that the temptation was spread over the days. These are the kind of coincidences—though not nearly so strong or so numerous as in many other sections—which suggest the use of a written document; and that document would be in these respects most nearly represented by St. Mark.

But then there is another group of expressions—not to lay stress upon the common root in “led,” which may not however be accidental—“Jesus,” “the devil,” “He hungered,” in which St. Matthew and St. Luke combine their forces against St. Mark: so that by the same criterion by which in a multitude of other instances we infer the priority of St. Mark, we should infer here his posteriority; we should infer that there was a common original which the other two Gospels represented better than he did. I have said that there are peculiarities in this section: it is not

one that I should choose on which to construct a theory of the mutual relations of the Gospels, and I cannot stay to discuss its bearing upon the whole question of those relations. I merely quote it as an example of this double phenomenon which we find in St. Mark, indications—*prima facie* indications, if you will, but a closer examination I believe will support them—of priority and posteriority side by side.

It is this double aspect of the Gospel which has led many critics to think that, although our Gospel is very like the original document, it is still not identical with it; that behind our St. Mark there was an original or proto-Mark slightly different from it. There are obvious difficulties and improbabilities in this view. Foremost among them is the question, how it can have entered into the head of any one to alter a document which lay before him just in these small respects and no more.

The student of the Synoptics is brought here face to face with a real problem; and he will do well to set steadily before him all the possible hypotheses he can think of for its solution. One hypothesis, which I am myself much inclined to keep in sight, though I should not venture to say that it was adequate to explain the facts, is, that these facts were not so much editorial as textual, that they did not mark any deliberate recension of the Gospel, but were only incidental to the process of copying. This I think we can prove, that, as we approach nearer to the autographs, the freedom of the copyists increases. In the first two or three copies, especially of the Gospel of St. Luke, it must have been very considerable indeed. Here we have a *vera causa*, which may be introduced if we want it. I hope some day to test more exactly how far it will carry us, but I doubt if it will carry us far enough.

Another expedient which has found increasing favour during the last ten years has for its chief recommendation

that it enables us to dispense with the assumption of an older form of the Gospel altogether. This expedient consists in the supposition, which is simple enough in itself, that the latest of the three Synoptists had seen, not only one, but both his predecessors. This position was stoutly maintained in a tract by Simons, *Hat der dritte Evangelist den kanonischen Matthäus benutzt?* (Bonn, 1880.) This tract has been for some time out of print, and I have not succeeded in obtaining access to a copy. Simons has succeeded in making a number of converts, including Holtzmann—who had been one of the chief advocates of an *Ur-Marcus* or proto-Mark—Wendt, and now Dr. Paul Ewald. Those who take this view have to explain how it is that St. Luke, if he was acquainted with our St. Matthew, nevertheless diverges from him so considerably. They do so by supposing that the use which he made of our first Gospel was very subsidiary, that he probably had not a copy before him when he wrote, and that the influence was only through the memory. No doubt this hypothesis would greatly simplify matters if it could be adopted. I cannot claim to have tested it in close detail, and yet I question whether it will account satisfactorily for the facts. The secondary features in St. Mark are one of the problems connected with the Synoptic Gospels which have not yet received, and most urgently need, a definitive solution.

Though Dr. P. Ewald accepts a theory which exempts him from the necessity of supposing an *Ur-Marcus*, or older form of the present Gospel, he yet does suppose such an older form, and that under rather peculiar conditions. His *Ur-Marcus* is simply our present Gospel, with three omissions: St. Mark i. 1-3, vii. 24 to viii. 26, and xvi. 9-20. For the last omission he has of course some textual authority. And one of his points is that the first omission

conforms to it: a Gospel without an end, he thinks, should be also a Gospel without a beginning. There might be something tempting in this, we might think that we were getting back to the original "notes without order" of Papias, if it were not that between those two points the order that exists is so good. I must not stay to argue the point. I can only say that the grounds alleged for these omissions do not seem to me to be convincing.

A question akin to this of the *Ur-Marcus* is that as to the composition of our second Gospel. Was any other source made use of in it besides the "Notes of the Preaching of St. Peter"? This is another important question about which critics are still divided. The leading supporters of the Two-Document Hypothesis take opposite sides here. Holtzmann says, No; the second evangelist derived his material entirely from St. Peter, unless it were a little which he got from tradition or from his own personal knowledge, such as the incident of the young man who fled at the arrest of Jesus. On this side, I believe, is to be ranked Dr. P. Ewald. Dr. Bernhard Weiss answers on the contrary, Yes; our second evangelist had the same two main documents as the rest. He also had access, not only to the "Notes of St. Peter's Preaching," but also to the *Logia* collected by St. Matthew. It will be observed that here we have another way of getting out of the difficulty caused by the secondary features in St. Mark. For the preaching of St. Peter he is himself the primary authority; but the *Logia* he did not reproduce so fully or so carefully as his colleagues. Hence there are not a few places where they must take precedence of him. I gather that Dr. Resch takes this view, and indeed goes beyond Dr. Weiss in the extent to which he believes that the *Logia* were used;¹ but he has not yet expressed himself

¹ *Agrapha*, p. 28.

fully on the subject. The theory at first sight seems a complicated and cumbrous one. It implies that the first and third evangelists used the same document, the *Logia*, twice over, once separately in its original form, and once as already (partially) incorporated in our St. Mark. And yet complex phenomena require a complex hypothesis to account for them. There is very much the same kind of objection to the theory of Holtzmann and his allies, who hold that the third evangelist used at once our first Gospel, as we have it, and the two separate documents out of which the larger part of it is constructed. In both cases the objection is real, but in neither is it fatal.

In investigating this question, an important factor is supplied by the "doublets," or apparently repeated sections, which occur in the Gospels, the presumption being that when the same event or saying is recorded twice over it is taken in each case from a different source. It is a merit of Mr. Badham's little book, *The Formation of the Gospels* (London, 1891), to have seized hold of this point. It seems to me however, that the passages which can be regarded as doublets will need more rigorously sifting, and also that it is too paradoxical to ascribe to the preaching of St. Peter just that part of the Synoptic tradition with which St. Mark is *not* associated.

W. SANDAY.

GRAVE REVERSES A DECISIVE TEST OF
CHARACTER.

“ Let the brother who is of low degree rejoice in that he is lifted up ; but the rich, in that he is brought low.”—JAMES i. 9, 10.

SIMPLE as these words sound, the wise have found them very difficult. And, indeed, most of us shrink from taking them in their plain, natural sense. Taken simply as they stand, they seem to teach that the poor man is to be very glad when he gets rich—not a very difficult duty perhaps ; and that the rich man is to be very glad when he becomes poor—a duty so difficult that no man can be sure that he would be equal to it. Even the commentators hesitate to demand so high a strain of virtue ; which, surely, is very disinterested of the commentators, since, as they are mostly poor men, one should have thought that *they* at least would have found this meaning to their mind, and would have been quite content to see rich men grow poor that poor men might grow rich.

But not the commentators alone, hardly any man ventures to take St. James as really meaning what he seems to mean ; *viz.* that the poor good man is to rejoice when he is lifted into wealth, and that the rich good man is to rejoice when he is pulled down into poverty. Most of us take him to mean that the exaltation in which the poor brother is to rejoice is a *spiritual* exaltation ; that he is to be glad because, though poor and low in this world’s esteem, he stands high among the saints and is rich toward God. In like manner we assume that the abasement in which the rich brother should rejoice is a *spiritual* abasement ; *he* is to be glad that, despite his opulence, he is of a lowly and contrite heart. All which may be very true in itself, but is not the truth taught here. For observe what we must do to force this meaning on

St. James's words. We must take one half of each of his phrases in its natural, and the other half in a non-natural sense; one half literally, and the other half figuratively. When he says "brother of low degree," we must understand him to mean a poor man of no social mark, not a brother very deficient in the graces of the Spirit; but when he speaks of this poor brother as being "lifted up," we are not to understand him as meaning that the poor man is lifted out of his poverty, but that he is raised to a heavenly wealth. So, again, when he says, "rich brother," we are to take him as indicating a man opulent in this world's goods; but so soon as he speaks of the rich man's being brought low, we are to understand, not that the rich man is brought down to penury, but that his heart is humbled, his spirit abased.

Now to read the Bible in this double sense, to take one part of the same sentence in one way and another part in a different way, is to make it mean anything—*i.e.* nothing. It is to put *our* meanings into it, and to deny that it has any meaning of its own. If we read it thus, we can never be sure that we have "the mind of the Spirit"; we shall make every Scripture "of a private interpretation," and open the door for as many interpretations as there are interpreters. We can only read the Bible to profit as we seek *first* the plain, obvious meaning of its words, and follow that, however sharply it may cut our prejudices against the grain.

Read fairly and simply, the words of St. James cannot fail to carry this plain sense to our minds: that the Christian brother who is poor in this world's goods is to be glad when he gets rich in this world's goods; and that the Christian brother who is rich in these goods is to be glad when God takes them away from him, since God will only take them away when it is for his good. And if we sincerely believed, as we profess to believe, spiritual

good to be better than temporal good, and spiritual wealth to be far more precious than temporal wealth, I am persuaded that we should never think of taking these words in any other sense.

For St. James is the plainest, the most prosaic, the least subtle and mystical, of the New Testament writers. He uses words in the simplest sense, and shapes them into the most pithy, downright sentences. He means what he says, and says what he means, beyond almost any other writer. He is the Cobbett, or the Defoe, of the New Testament company. You need never misunderstand him. It is almost impossible to misunderstand him except by thrusting meanings into his words which never entered into his mind. And therefore, even if these verses stood alone, we might be quite sure that he meant just what we should mean if in our common talk we said, "A poor man is to be glad when he gets rich; and a rich man, when his riches use their wings and fly away."

But the verses do not stand alone. They are intimately connected both with the verses which go before and the verses which follow them. Directly he has uttered his opening salutation, the Apostle strikes his key-note. In the Salutation he had wished the Christians of the Hebrew Dispersion joy—"Joy to you." But what a wish was that for men whom their heathen neighbours hated because they were Jews, and their Jewish neighbours hated because they were Christians! How could men so miserable hope for joy? St. James teaches them: "Count it all joy, pure joy, nothing but joy, when ye fall into divers tribulations; and then surely you, whose whole life is a bitter trial, will never be at a loss for joy." But what was this strange art of extracting joy from sorrow, honour from shame, gain from loss? St. James teaches them this also. Trials beget that patient and constant temper of the faithful soul which makes a man sound, mature, complete in character,

so that he lacks nothing. If, then, they made perfection of Christian character their first aim, preferring it before all happy outward conditions, they would rejoice in any condition, and in any change of condition, which put their character to the test and helped to make it perfect. Constancy in trial makes a man perfect, as in other ways, so also in this: it fosters a single mind in him; it compels him to subordinate the lower cravings to the higher aspirations of the soul; it frees him from the distractions of a divided will, from that two-mindedness which cripples his energies and mars his service. Once possessed of the firm, constant temper which is bred by trials well endured, he is no longer a man of two minds, unstable in all his ways, and therefore excelling in none. But if trials have this happy effect on character, may he not well count it all joy when he falls into them? May he not well rejoice even in the largest and most trying reverses of fortune? If he be a rich man, and is suddenly brought down to poverty, there is in this reverse a searching and decisive test of character. Let him be patient now, amid his broken schemes and defeated hopes; let him sincerely rejoice in any change of condition which proves and fortifies his character: and is he not obviously the better for his trial, advancing even toward that perfection in which he will lack nothing? If, on the other hand, he be a poor man, and suddenly grow rich, there is in his reverse of fortune a trial equally searching, and perhaps more searching. And if, when this penetrating test is applied, he retain a constant loyalty to Christ, if he remain sober, modest, kindly, devout, will not this trial have helped to make him perfect? Should not we ourselves trust and honour each of these men, after he had borne his trial well, more than before the trial fell upon him?

Holding perfection of character to be the highest good, St. James could honestly bid men rejoice in whatever

change, or reverse, tested and matured their character; he could honestly pronounce those "blessed" who endured temptation, and rose, through many trials, to the crown of life.

So that these verses, taken quite simply and literally, fall in with the whole scope of the Apostle's argument. With that argument in view it becomes impossible to take them in any other than this plain sense. The poor man *is* to be glad when he is tried by riches, remembering, however, that for him they *are* a trial; and the rich man is to be glad when he is tried by poverty, and to take comfort in the conviction that it is a trial, and a trial by which God is seeking to make a man of him, a man rounded and complete in character, lacking nothing that he ought to have.

The ruling thought of these verses is, then, that great reverses of fortune are a test of Christian character, and a means of Christian perfection; and that we ought not simply to bear them patiently, but to rejoice in them because they so test our character as to mature and perfect it. Does not the world itself admire such an one as Hamlet describes in Horatio?

"Thou hast been
As one, in suffering all, that suffers nothing;
A man that fortune's buffets and rewards
Hast ta'en with equal thanks: and blest are those
Whose blood and judgment are so well commingled
That they are not a pipe for fortune's finger
To sound what stop she please."

And if Shakespeare, with the world's full assent, might pronounce such a man "blest," why should not St. James? why should not we?

Yet no one will deny that the reverses by which such a character is formed are very searching and stringent trials, very hard to meet in a manly, still harder to meet in a

Christian, spirit. When you see a poor good man suddenly made rich, are you not a little afraid for him, though, perhaps, in the same circumstances, you would have no fear for yourself? Do you not fear that he may lose in humility, in sobriety, in spirituality; that he will mind earthly things now that he has so much to mind; that he will indulge and pamper his senses with unaccustomed luxuries; that his devotion to Christ and the Church of Christ may grow weaker now that he is bound to the world by so many pleasant ties? Are not *these* your fears? and have you not grave reason for them in history and experience? On the other hand, when you see a "rich brother," who has been successful in business, and for many years has lived in luxury and ease, suddenly reduced to comparative penury, or even to absolute want: if he has to "begin life again" when the strength and sanguine hopefulness of youth are past, do you not fear for *him*? Do you not fear that his piety may prove to have been a mere adjunct of his prosperity; that his patience may fail him; that he may grow sour, irritable, suspicious; that he may fail to get any good from the evil which has befallen him; that he may confound misfortune with disgrace, lose his self-respect, and conclude that he has forfeited the respect of men because it has pleased God to bring him low?

The shoe does not always pinch where our neighbours think it does. The most searching test in these great reverses is often, not in their direct, but in their indirect, consequences. A man, without being a hero, may have so much of goodness and of good sense as that a sudden access of fortune would make little difference to him, none *in* him, if he stood alone in the world: and yet it may pierce and try him to the heart because others share it with him. He may have a vulgar wife, fond of show, or children who *will* give themselves airs, or friends who flatter or fawn upon

him, or servants whose solemn, formal deference gives him a sense of importance; and by all these indirect influences his own standard of thought and duty may be insensibly changed and lowered. And the other man, the rich man who has been smitten with poverty, may be affected in a similar manner. To a sensible good man outward changes are of little moment save as they affect character and usefulness. How many a good fellow have we all known to whom the hard work and comparative penury of a reduced income has been a positive relief, and who would have snapped his fingers at "Fortune and her wheel" had he had no one to care for but himself, or had those for whom he was bound to care been likeminded with himself! But if he has a wife who frets or storms, or children who sulk and wrangle; if those immediately dependent on him are too "stuck up" to work for their bread, and yet cannot eat their bread without a good deal of the best butter,—then his trial may become very penetrating and severe. Our worst troubles, our sharpest griefs, are not always where men place them. Many a man would be modest in good fortune or cheerful under ill fortune, if those who stand nearest to him were of as Christian a heart as he. But when those to whom we look for example or sympathy or co-operation fail us; if parents give us only blame when we need their pity, or children who ought to be a help become a burden, then we are poor and tried indeed.

Are we to rejoice in such trials as these? Yes, even in these; for these, too, test our character and may help to make us perfect. St. James, indeed, speaks only of poverty and riches; but of course he includes under these terms whatever other changes or reverses they involve. And if a man find his kind, pleasant wife changed into a "fine lady" by prosperity, or into a shrew by adversity; if a woman find her once kind and manly husband turned into a fretful poltroon by misfortune, or into a lazy sensualist

by wealth, these sorrowful changes are part of the reverses which have come upon them; they are among the consequences of having been "lifted up" or "brought low"; and in these also the Apostle bids us rejoice.

Now is it possible that any man should be honestly glad to find himself penniless, for example, with a wife and children about him whose prospects have been blighted, and whose tempers have been soured? Let us put the question in that plain, practical way; for when the Lord Jesus bids us rejoice and be exceeding glad in the day of tribulation, or His "brother" James bids us count it pure joy when we fall into divers trials, there is a stately roll about the words, and so many sacred associations cluster round them, that they sound remote from the real, pressing experiences of our daily life; and it is here, in our daily life, that we want to know our duty and get help to do it.

Well, conceive as miserable a case as you can. Suppose a man reduced at a blow from affluence to want when his best days are past. Plague him with a scolding wife, lazy, ne'er-do-well sons, ailing, uppish, peevish daughters. Let his work be hard, uncertain, ill-paid; his home squalid and bare; his food scanty and ill-dressed. Let him suspect his friends of turning from him, and his neighbours of whispering as he passes by. Let him find his opportunities of culture and his means of usefulness curtailed. Heap upon him, in short, whatever you yourself most dread. And when the full, dismal burden is upon him, could you go to him and say, "Be of good courage, sir, and let thine heart be glad; for blessed is the man who endureth trial, since, when he is proved, he shall receive the crown of life"? No; you or I could not say that. We should not have the heart, we should not have the faith, to say it; but St. James *can* say it, and does, says it honestly, heartily, cheerfully. And to the poor souls who *must* bear their burden, which is the better comforter, you or I, who can only be

sorry for them, or St. James, who is not one whit sorry for them, and can teach them not to be sorry for themselves? Surely St. James is, out of all comparison, the better comforter; for who can comfort the afflicted like the man who can show them how to extract from affliction itself a deep and abiding joy?

Before *we* can honestly give, or take, the Apostle's comfort, we must occupy his position, we must hold his convictions, we must rise to the full stature of men in Christ Jesus. St. James held that this world would soon pass away, and that we should still sooner pass out of it; but that there is another world in which we shall live for ever, and in which our conditions will be shaped by our character. In his view, therefore, the chief aim of every man was, or should be, to form in himself a character which would best fit him both for the life that now is, and for that which is to come. It mattered very little whether he was rich or poor in things which he must soon leave behind him; what did matter was that by the enjoyment or by the loss of these things he should be qualifying himself for, should be laying hold of, the life which is eternal. Whatever changes, whatever reverses, contributed to elevate, purify, complete the power and quality of his life, and stamp on it the characters of immortality, should therefore be welcome to him. If poverty would test, raise, mature his character, welcome poverty; if wealth, welcome wealth. The whole visible world, with all its kingdoms and treasures, was of worth to him in proportion as it served to form a strong, pure, and noble character in him. Knowledge, wisdom, faith, righteousness, hope, charity, were the chief things of life; all else was valuable as it fostered and developed these, and became worthless and pernicious the moment it impeded or thwarted them.

These were St. James's views of human life, views which the brother of the Lord had learned from the Lord Him-

self, as we too may learn them from Him if we study the Sermon on the Mount. And it is only when these views have become our personal convictions that we can attain that independence of outward conditions, that power of making every breath or blow of change subserve our true interests, which will enable the poor brother to rejoice wisely when he is tested by wealth, and the rich brother to rejoice manfully when he is tested by poverty. In fine, we can only do what James bids us do when our religion becomes a sacred reality, pervading our whole life, governing every thought, passion, and aspiration of the soul. To too many of us, alas! our religion is like a stop in an organ, which we can pull out and shut off at will. On Sunday morning we pull it out, and for a time it discourses sweet music to us; but on Sunday evening we push it in, and use it no more till the week has run out. Religion is only the *Sunday* stop in the organ of our life. We are not of those

“With whom the melodies *abide*
Of the everlasting chime;
Who carry music in their heart
Through dusky lane and wrangling mart,
Plying their daily task with busier feet
Because their secret souls a holy strain repeat.”

And till we rise into a higher life, into a religious life, more real and deep, we must not hope to attain that large freedom of spirit for which neither opulence nor penury has any bonds. We who are not masters of ourselves if markets fall, how can *we* rejoice when we are brought low? If we would be lords of ourselves and of our fate, if we would be independent of outward conditions, if we would compel all changes and reverses to serve us and minister to our welfare, we must learn to be in the world as Christ was in the world—in it, but not of it; we must seek *first* that kingdom of God which is within us; we must live as

those who can never die. Do we lack wisdom, or strength, for this high task and enterprise? Are we feeling at this moment how much we lack it? Let us ask it of God, then; and it shall be given us.

S. COX.

THE ARAMAIC GOSPEL.

INDICATIONS OF TRANSLATION.

WE wish now to address ourselves definitely to the task of endeavouring to prove, as we have promised, that certain portions of the synoptic Gospels present indications of having been translated from a common Aramaic original. We have enumerated what seem to us the usual concomitants of translation work from a foreign source, when that source is known; and to guard ourselves from error we have illustrated each point from the two translations of the Hebrew Scriptures, as presented in the Septuagint and the New Testament quotations. But when we come to the converse case, of deciding whether the productions of some two or three men, which bear singular marks of resemblance, be really translation work, we find that the concomitants referred to are far from being equally useful. It would, for instance, be of very little value for our present undertaking were we to show that, in certain sections, the synoptists "agree in substance, but not in words"; for in describing an event in the life of our Lord, or reporting one of His discourses, that sort of agreement is precisely what we should expect if the Saviour spoke Greek, and the evangelists made no use of any common material. Similarly, if one were to endeavour to show that certain sections in the synoptists contain more Aramaisms than others, that might be serviceable in proving that the Gospels were

compilations, but it would go a very short way toward proving that those sections had been *translated* from the Aramaic; for the common source might, after all, have been composed in Greek, and the idioms might be due to the fact that the native tongue was more deeply ingrained in the constitution of that Jewish author than of some others. Before we reach *terra firma* we must pass on to indication No. IV.; namely, that in a text written without vowels, as all Semitic texts were in those days, the readers were liable to read different vowels into the same consonants. This liability to error may be illustrated from some of the systems of short-hand, where the vowels are not written, but have to be inserted by the reader. If we can succeed in showing, in several instances, that the divergent words in our Greek Gospels yield, when translated into Aramaic, precisely the same consonants, and that *the diverse vocalization of these same consonants yields the diverse meanings that are found in our present Gospels*, we venture to think that we shall be making out a strong case in support of our theory that in these passages the evangelists were translating from a common Aramaic original.

1. Our first illustration shall be of a simple character. In connexion with the cure of the man with the withered hand in the synagogue at Capernaum, his condition is described in variant, but precisely equivalent terms, thus:

Matt. xii. 10: τὴν χεῖρα ἔχων ξηράν.

Mark iii. 1: ἐξηραμμένην ἔχων τὴν χεῖρα.

In Aramaic the difference between the adjective *ξηράν*; *dry*, and the participle *ἐξηραμμένην*, *dried, withered*, is simply that of the diverse vocalization of the text-word יבִישׁ. If in perusing the MS. the reader pronounced the word יבִישׁ, he would obtain the adjective *dry*, "aridus, siccus"¹; a

¹ Permit me at the outset to express my indebtedness, in general and in particular, to the two invaluable lexicons, Buxtorf's *Lexicon Chaldaicum*,

word which occurs in Ezekiel xxxvii. 2, "The bones were very *dry*." Whereas if he were to insert vowels thus: $\Psi\bar{\iota}\bar{\iota}$, he would obtain the participle of the intransitive verb $\Psi\bar{\iota}\bar{\iota}$, which means to *become dry, be withered*, as in 1 Kings xiii. 4: $\Psi\bar{\iota}\bar{\iota}$ $\bar{\iota}\bar{\iota}$, "His (Jeroboam's) hand was dried up." We attach very little value however, for our present purpose, to instances of this kind, where the two divergent Greek words are from the same Greek root; the case will be incalculably stronger when we adduce words which in Greek have no apparent affinity, and show that these meanings belong to the same Aramaic text-word with different vowels attached.

2. A much more pertinent illustration is one which occurs in the parable of the sower, which as might have been anticipated, has proved to us quite a mine—the parable and its interpretation yielding no less than sixteen cases illustrative of our theory,¹ though most of them fall under indications V. and VI.

MATT. xiii. 4.	MARK iv. 4.	LUKE viii. 5.
$\bar{\alpha}$ μὲν ἔπεσεν	δ μὲν ἔπεσεν	δ μὲν ἔπεσεν
παρὰ τὴν ὁδόν·	παρὰ τὴν ὁδόν·	παρὰ τὴν ὁδόν,
καὶ ἦλθε	καὶ ἦλθε	καὶ κατεπατήθη,
τὰ πετεινά,	τὰ πετεινά,	καὶ τὰ πετεινά
		τοῦ οὐρανοῦ
καὶ κατέφαγεν αὐτά.	καὶ κατέφαγεν αὐτό.	κατέφαγεν αὐτό.

The first two evangelists say, "There *came* the fowls and devoured it." Luke says, "It *was trodden down*, and the fowls devoured it." Why this diversity in so much similarity? It is evident that our Lord did not use *both* words;

Talmudicum, et Rabbinicum, edited and enlarged by Dr. B. Fischer (Leipzig, 1875); and Levy's *Chaldäisches Wörterbuch über die Targumim* (Leipzig, 1866). Both are indispensable, because arranged on different principles. In many respects I have also found useful a lexicon published at Padua in 1747, by A. Zanolini.

¹ It may here be stated that the sixty cases promised in January have already been more than doubled.

and even if we may shrink from pronouncing in most cases which evangelist gives our Lord's precise meaning, yet it will surely be an immense relief if we can see how the divergences arose. If now we turn to Buxtorf, we find a word ܩܪܝܗ , which means (1) *calcare, conculcare*, to tread upon, crush; (2) *ingredi, incedere*, to come in, to enter. Precisely the meanings we require. In the former sense it occurs in Deuteronomy xi. 24: "Every place whereon the sole of your foot shall *tread* shall be yours." In the second sense it occurs in Proverbs vi. 11: "Thy poverty shall come and enter (or, rush) in upon thee." So that if it can be admitted that the Saviour's words were written down in the Aramaic as they were spoken, the only difference between these two divergent Greek words is, that of reading different vowels into the same Aramaic text-word.

Matthew and Mark would yield: $\text{ܩܪܝܗ ܕܪܝܗ ܥܘܦܐ ܘܢܐܒܠ ܘܩܗܐ}$

Luke requires: $\text{ܩܪܝܗ ܕܪܝܗ ܘܨܘܦܐ ܘܢܐܒܠ ܘܩܗܐ}$

We may mention in passing (though the case belongs to VI.) how readily the difference between "root" and "moisture" is explained on our theory.

Matthew and Mark say: $\delta\iota\alpha\ \tau\omicron\ \mu\eta\ \epsilon\chi\epsilon\iota\ \rho\acute{\iota}\zeta\alpha\nu$ ". . . no root."

Luke: $\delta\iota\alpha\ \tau\omicron\ \mu\eta\ \epsilon\chi\epsilon\iota\ \iota\kappa\mu\acute{\alpha}\delta\alpha$ ". . . no moisture."

But the Aramaic word for "root" is (as in Hebrew) שֶׁרֶשׁ , while the word for "moisture," "succus, lachryma, humor arborum vel herbarum" is שֶׁרֶי —a difference in one letter only.

3. In the interpretation of the parable of the sower, among the things which, after the manner of thorns, choke the good seed, we find

Mark iv. 19: $\alpha\acute{\iota}\ \pi\epsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\ \tau\alpha\ \lambda\omicron\iota\pi\acute{\alpha}\ \epsilon\pi\iota\theta\upsilon\mu\acute{\iota}\alpha\iota.$

Luke viii. 14: $\eta\delta\omicron\nu\alpha\acute{\iota}\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \beta\acute{\iota}\omicron\nu.$

We wish now to show how closely these expressions, "desires for other things" and "pleasures of life," resemble

each other in Aramaic. But first we would direct attention to a fact which has escaped the notice of most of our lexicographers, that *βίος* in later Greek acquired the meaning of *luxurious life*, "fast life"; as when *we* say that a young man is anxious to go up to London to see "life." That this is so is evident from Hesychius, who in his lexicon defines *βίος* as (1) ζωή, (2) περιουσία; (1) life, (2) abundance or luxury; and as an instance of this meaning we may quote 1 John ii. 16, "The pride of life." I premise then that Luke's phrase, ἡδονὰι τοῦ βίου, means pleasures of luxury, or, of the fast life. But if we turn to Buxtorf, we find a noun, כּוּתָר, which has precisely the meanings of περιουσία. Liddell and Scott define περιουσία as (1) residue, surplus; (2) abundance, luxury: and Buxtorf defines כּוּתָר as (1) "residuum, reliquum"; (2) "abundantia, emolumentum." As an instance of this, compare the Targum of Isaiah i. 9, "Unless the abundance of the goodness (כּוּתָר טוֹבִיָּה) of Jehovah had left us a remnant." There can be no doubt that we have there the Aramaic equivalent of the Pauline phrase, ὁ πλοῦτος τῆς χρηστότητος, "the riches of His goodness"; or, as Grimm suggests, "The abundance or plenitude of His goodness." That the leanings of the word are to the side of "superabundance" is clear from the fact that its cognates denote "redundance, prodigality." The word כּוּתָר means then (1) "reliquum"; but that is precisely equivalent to τὰ λοιπά in Mark's Gospel; (2) "abundantia," which is exactly βίος in its secondary sense as περιουσία. So that if כּוּתָר occurred in an Aramaic text, there would be a reasonable doubt whether it should be rendered "other things," or "abundance," "luxury." By the way, would not the rendering of Psalm xvii. 14 be much improved if it were conceded that the Hebrew word יָתֵר would have the same natural history as its cognate in Aramaic, and mean (1) residue, (2) surplus, wealth, luxury, and we were to ren-

der: "They leave their superabundance, their extravagant wealth, to their babes"? Aquila in this passage renders יִתְּן *περιουσία*.

Further, we have the homologue ἡδοναί and ἐπιθυμίας. These are, in Latin, the *desiderabilia* and the *desideria*, the "desirable things" and the "desires" of life; and from the verb רָגַג, to "seek, desire, long for," we obtain (1) רָגַגְתָּ, that for which one longs, *pleasure*, delight—as when the Lord said to Ezekiel (xxiv. 16), "Behold, I take away the *delight* of thine eyes with a stroke"; and (2) רָגַגְתָּ or רָגַגְתָּ, *desire*, craving—as in Job xxxi. 35, "My *desire* is that God would answer me," and Deuteronomy xii. 20, "Thou mayest eat after all the desire of thy soul." So that the difference between these two phrases is very slight.

The pleasures of luxury = רָגַגְתָּ דְּמֹוֹתֵר.

The desires for other things = רָגַגְתָּ דְּמֹוֹתֵר.

4. Our next two illustrations shall be taken from the narrative of the healing of the lunatic boy, after our Lord descended from the mount of transfiguration. We have in the parallel passages of Mark and Luke two phrases which no harmonist has ventured to consider equivalent, and yet they yield most clearly to the solution we apply.

Luke ix. 39: Καὶ μόγις ἀποχωρεῖ ἀπ' αὐτοῦ συντριβόν αὐτόν.

And it hardly departeth from him, sorely-bruising him.

Mark ix. 18: Καὶ τρίξει τοὺς ὀδόντας, καὶ ξηραίνεται.

And he grindeth his teeth, and pineth away.

The words which illustrate our present point are *συντριβόν* and *ξηραίνεται*, but the rest shall receive our attention. There is an Aramaic verb, פָּרַךְ, which means (1) to dry up, parch, fry; (2) to crumble, crush, break in pieces. But these are just the two meanings desiderated. *Συντριβώ*, to shatter, smash, bruise, gives the second meaning of פָּרַךְ; and *ξηραίνεται*, withers, is dried, parched,

corresponds to the first meaning in the passive, as, *e.g.*, in Lamentation iv. 8, "Their skin cleaveth to their bone; it has become withered, פְּרִיךְ, like a stick."

Thus *συντρῖβον* is פְּרִיךְ, active participle Peal;

ξηραίνεται is פְּרִיךְ, passive participle Peal.

And the rest of the words are almost equally alike when reduced to Aramaic. The Aramaic and Hebrew word for "grinding" the teeth is חֲרַק, and the word to "depart from, flee from," is עֲרַק. I shall presently adduce evidence to show that the *Logia* was a Galilæan document, and it is well known that both Galilæans and Samaritans were very negligent in the pronunciation of gutturals; indeed in the Samaritan Targum the same words are spelt with ח or ע indifferently: so that the difference between חֲרַק and עֲרַק is of the slightest possible kind. Then μόγισ, "with labour," "with difficulty," is בְּעֵינָי; for עֵינָי, according to Buxtorf, means (1) "negotium," business, and (2) "molestia," annoyance. And "with the teeth" (for חֲרַק is followed by בְּ), is בְּשֵׁנַי. Therefore, neglecting the pronouns, which are always more or less at the option of the translator, the difference between these apparently incompatible phrases is simply this:

Luke ix. 39: ובענין ערק פריך.

Mark ix. 18: ובישנין חרק פריך.

5. There is another couplet in the same narrative which admits of a similar explanation:

MARK ix. 20.

καὶ ἤνεγκαν αὐτὸν πρὸς αὐτόν
καὶ ἰδὼν αὐτόν,
τὸ πνεῦμα
ἔσπαράξεν αὐτόν.

LUKE ix. 42.

ἔτι δὲ προσερχόμενον αὐτοῦ
ἔρρηξεν αὐτὸν
τὸ δαιμόνιον,
καὶ σπασάραξεν.

The two words which we wish to identify are ἰδὼν, "when he saw," and ἔρρηξεν, "he broke," or "tore." In an unvocalized Aramaic text these words would be undis-

tinguishable. *ἔρρηξεν* is קרַח, 3 s. pret. Aphel of קרַח, to crush, break, bruise: and *ἰδών*, or rather *εἶδεν*, is קרַח, 3 s. pret. Aphel of קרַח, to gaze at, stare at. Could any one wish for a better explanation of the divergence than that the word קרַח in our hypothetical Aramaic document was by one reader pronounced קרַח, "he tore," or "bruised him," and by the other קרַח, "he gazed at him"? He who assents to this will raise no objection to me if I maintain that the difference between *ἤνεγκαν αὐτόν*, "they brought him," and *προσερχόμενον αὐτοῦ*, "he came near," has arisen from the confusion of the Peal קרַח, to come near, with the Pael קרַח, to bring near.

6. We will now turn to the Sermon on the Mount, and to the well-known variation in giving the words of our Lord:

Matt. v. 48: Be ye perfect, *τέλειοι*, as, etc.

Luke vi. 36: Be ye compassionate, *οἰκτίρμονες*, as, etc.

I would suggest that the one word which was used by our Lord was some form of חסל, which means (1) to bring to an end, "ad finem et complementum perducere," and (2) to nurse, foster, bring to maturity, wean. So that חסיל, perfected, completed—the passive participle—is the equivalent of *τέλειος*; and חסיל, the active participle, may well be rendered by *οἰκτίρμων*, as denoting the compassionate mother-love manifested to the suckling-child. The noun חסיל occurs in the Targum of Psalm ciii. 2 in the rendering of "forget not all His *benefits*." Buxtorf would translate חסיל "beneficia," kindnesses; but Levy insists on a stronger meaning, "Nahrungszustand, Nahrungsweise, besonders vom Kinde an der Mutterbrust." So that, according to Levy, the Targum means, "Forget not thy motherly manner of nourishment by God,"—how God nourishes thee with a mother's love. The reader who can endorse this, and will read into the context of both New

Testament passages the word ܠܝܫܬܐ, with its tender association of the maturing, fostering care of mother-love, will, we venture to think, begin to realize what a priceless treasure we shall possess if we can re-discover the Aramaic Gospel.

7. And now we will turn to the narrative of the Gadarene demoniac, which yields abundant evidence of having formed part of the primitive Gospel.

MARK v. 16.

καὶ διηγήσαντο αὐτοῖς
οἱ ἰδόντες,
πῶς ἐγένετο τῷ δαιμονιζομένῳ,
καὶ περὶ τῶν χοίρων,
καὶ ἤρξαντο
παρακαλεῖν αὐτὸν
ἀπελθεῖν ἀπὸ τῶν ὀρίων αὐτῶν.

LUKE viii. 36.

ἀπήγγειλαν δὲ αὐτοῖς
οἱ ἰδόντες,
πῶς ἐσώθη ὁ δαιμονισθείς.
καὶ τὸ τῆς περιχώρου
ἦσαν πλήθος
ἠρώτησαν αὐτὸν
ἀπελθεῖν ἀπ' αὐτῶν.

It will be noted that I have slightly altered the *order* of the words in our Greek Gospels, so as to place the phrases which seem to me to be homologous on the same line; but this I must in all cases claim the privilege to do. There is certainly abundance of diversity in these parallel columns, and it must surely be admitted as a strong argument, if we can show that *each line* can be reduced to the same or closely similar letters as written in an Aramaic document.

The words which more immediately concern us are *χοίρων*, "swine," and *περιχώρου*, "neighbourhood." The same Aramaic text-word differently vocalized would yield both these meanings. The first is ܢܘܪܝܐ; the second ܢܘܪܝܐ. If, as is probable, the letters ܘ and ܝ, which are called "matres lectionis," were inserted very sparingly in ancient Semitic writing, we then have ܢܘܪܐ as the one word, meaning, according to the vowels inserted, "swine" or "neighbourhood."

As to the other homologues, we will take them in order. We have first *διηγήσαντο* and *ἀπήγγειλαν*, the very two

verbs which (as we showed last month) are used by the LXX. and Hebrews ii. 12 respectively in their rendering of Psalm xxii. 23 (22), "I will *declare*, דִּיכְרִיִּי, Thy name unto my brethren." This shows how feasible our theory really is. We know that διηγῆσομαι and ἀπαγγελῶ are variant renderings of the one Hebrew word דִּיכְרִיִּי. All we maintain is, that διηγῆσαντο and ἀπήγγειλαν in the Gospels are also variant renderings of the Aramaic word דִּיכְרִיִּי, which verb is the equivalent of דִּכְרִי, and is indeed used for it in the Targum of the passage referred to.

The next pair of words is ἐγένετο and ἐσώθη. Mark: "How *it happened* to the demoniac"; Luke: "How the demoniac *was saved*." The identification which I have here to offer does not quite satisfy me. We have the word דִּכְרִי, which means (1) to turn out, eject, vomit; and (2) intransitively, to be freed, rescued, escape, "liberari, eripi, evadere." This of course suits well ἐσώθη, "was saved"; but can דִּכְרִי mean also to *befall, happen*? I cannot find that it does. It would be *natural* for it to do so. The Latin verbs *evenire* and *evadere* mean (1) to go out, (2) to befall. Our word "turn out" is also used in the sense of "befall." Possibly in the vernacular therefore the word דִּכְרִי took the same course as the Latin *evadere*.

The next couplet is ἤρξαντο, "they began," and πλῆθος, multitude. This divergence seems to me to have arisen from the confusion of two similar words (1) דִּכְרִי or דִּכְרִי, Pt. Pael of דִּכְרִי, to begin: and (2) דִּכְרִי, a company, caravan; which meaning would suit well the company of swineherds referred to.

The identification of παρακαλεῖν and ἐρωτᾶν is very clear. These are simply variant translations of the one word דִּכְרִי, which means "quærere, petere, rogare, orare, obsecrare"; that is, (1) to ask, (2) to beseech. Almost equally evident is the cause of the variation in ἀπ' αὐτῶν, "from them," and ἀπὸ τῶν ὀρίων αὐτῶν, "from their coasts." In Ara-

maic the difference is merely that of one letter. There is a word, בַּר , בְּרָא , which means the *open country*, the district *outside* the customary haunts of men. Then מִבְּרָא as an adverb and preposition means “*outside*,” “*aloof from*.” But there is also a word בְּרִיא , a boundary, border, *coast*; so that the solution is to be sought in the confusion of these two similar words.

8. Our last illustration shall be drawn from the account of the lowering of the paralytic through the roof. This event is narrated with numerous divergences in each of the three synoptists, and it must surely be good news to the perplexed Bible student to be assured that these verbal divergences might arise in the simplest way in the process of translating from an Aramaic document, if he will only concede the existence of such a document, and that it was used by each of the three evangelists.

We would first speak of the divergent phrases :

Matt. ix 2: ἐπὶ κλίνης βεβλημένον, lying on a bed.

Mark ii. 3: αἰρόμενον ὑπὸ τεσσάρων, carried by four.

No one feels these expressions incompatible, but would any one suppose that these two phrases might with equal correctness be the rendering of the same Aramaic letters when unvocalized? If this can be shown, will it not materially strengthen our position? Let us examine the point. The Aramaic word for “four” is אַרְבַּעָה ; but one of the synonyms for “bed” is אַרְבַּעָה , strictly, that on which one stretches oneself, lies down at full length, a bed; or rather, may we not say a *stretcher*? So that apart from the context, the consonants אַרְבַּעָה may with equal propriety be rendered “four” or “bed.”

Then as to the words $\beta\epsilon\beta\lambda\eta\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\nu$ (passive participle of $\beta\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\omega$, to throw; passive, to be thrown down, to lie prostrate) and $\alpha\iota\rho\acute{o}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\nu$ (passive participle of $\alpha\iota\rho\omega$, to carry), these meanings both belong to one word in Aramaic;

viz. טַלְטַל, Palpel participle of טַל. The meanings of טַל given by Buxtorf are (1) "ejicere, projicere," to *throw out, throw down, cast forth*; and (2) "portare, transportare," to *carry, remove*. In the former of these two meanings it occurs both in the Hebrew and Targum of Isaiah xxii. 17: "Behold, Jehovah will throw thee down (as) with the throwing of a man." But what is more to our present purpose, the verb is (like βάλλω) used in the passive of *lying prostrate*, through sickness or in sleep; especially is the Hophal used in this sense in rabbinic literature. The Targums usually prefer the passive of רָמָא, which is the equivalent of טַל. But, as we have said, טַלְטַל also means to carry, to carry to and fro, to cause to wander, banish; *e.g.* 2 Samuel xv. 20, where David says to Ittai the Gittite, "Should I cause thee to wander to and fro (Revised Version, 'up and down') with us?" The passive of this, the Ithpalpel, would mean "to be carried to and fro, up and down," and thus the passive participle מְטַלְטַל might mean either, "being thrown down, lying prostrate," βεβλημένον, or "being carried to and fro," αἰρόμενον. And as for the prepositions ἐπὶ and ὑπὸ, it is probable that they represent גַּב, which means (1) upon; (2) with, near, beside. If, as is likely, the man was carried on the shoulders of the bearers, the word גַּב, in the sense of "upon," would correctly represent both the ἐπί and the ὑπό. So that the Aramaic words, of which the renderings of Matthew and Mark are a possible translation, are

מְטַלְטַל גַּב אַרְבַּעַה

9. If we turn to the Gospel of Luke, we find that the corresponding clause is: "They sought to bring him in, and to place him before Him." Can it be shown that this is a free translation of the above Aramaic words? We think so. If we vocalize the participle actively, as Palpel, thus, מְטַלְטַל, we obtain the meaning, "Carrying him up

and down, hither and thither." The Palpel form is always indicative of rapid movement, excited effort; and if any one wished to represent freely and graphically the Palpel significance of the verb, and the way in which the weary but resolute bearers went hither and thither around the rim of the crowd to find access to the Saviour, he could not use more suitable words than those of Luke, "seeking to bring him in."

But what about the word ארבעה? We have shown that, variously vocalized, it may mean "four" or "a stretcher"; can it also yield Luke's rendering, *θεῖναι αὐτόν*, "to place him"? It can and does. The word *θεῖναι* is infinitive, and the Aphel inf. of רבע is אַרְבַּעָא. Add the 3rd sing. suffix, and we obtain אַרְבַּעוּתָהּ or אַרְבַּעָהּ. But רבע means to stretch, to lie at full length, and the Aphel means, to cause to lie, to lay, to place in a recumbent position. In the legend given in the Targum of Jonathan as to the burial of Moses, we are told that Michael and Gabriel spread forth the golden bier set with precious stones, and hung with purple silk, and that Metatron and other sages *laid him upon it*, אַרְבַּעוּן יְתִיָה עֲלוּהָ. Similar as to posture, but widely different in other respects, is the force of the word in Deuteronomy xxv. 2 (Jonathan): "The judge shall *cause him to lie down*, יַרְבַּעֵנִיָה, and they shall scourge him (the convicted criminal) in his presence." So that ארבעה, if vocalized as Aphel inf., means "to lay him down or place him"; *θεῖναι αὐτόν*. And as for Luke's words *ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ*, we have that in נִבְיָה, near him, beside him. So that we arrive at the remarkable conclusion that the three diverse phrases in the several Gospels might all be derived from the same three Aramaic words, with the solitary exception of one letter, נבה for גב. So that the words in Luke are a free translation of

בְּיַמְלִיגָל וְנִבְיָה אַרְבַּעָה

10. The details of lowering the man through the roof are given in Mark and Luke: not in Matthew. Let us examine them.

MARK ii. 4.
 καὶ μὴ δυνάμενοι
 προσεῖργκαι αὐτῶ
 διὰ τὸν ὄχλον
 ἀπεστέγασαν τὴν στέγην
 ὅπου ἦν,
 καὶ ἐξορέξαντες
 χαλῶσι τὸν κράββατον
 ἐφ' ᾧ ὁ παραλυτικὸς κατέκειτο.

LUKE v. 19.
 καὶ μὴ εἰρόντες διὰ ποίους
 εἰσενέγκωσι αὐτὸν,
 διὰ τὸν ὄχλον,
 ἀναβάντες ἐπὶ τὸ δῶμα
 διὰ
 τῶν κεράμων
 καθήκαν αὐτὸν σὺν τῷ κλιιδίῳ.

The words which illustrate our present point are in the fourth line ἀπεστέγασαν, “they removed, uncovered,” and ἀναβάντες, they went up. The Aramaic equivalent for the Hebrew הָלַךְ, to go up, is רָלַךְ, but the Pael רָלַךְ means to cause to go up, to raise, to lift and carry off. So that the difference between Mark and Luke is merely that of attaching different vowels to סִלְקוּ: סִלְקוּ = they went up; רָלַךְ = they removed.

But what of the corresponding words “house” and “roof”? Do these yield to our solution? Most readily, if all will now admit that those scholars were right who have maintained that the house in question was a peasant’s house: for the word for cottage or hut, “tugurium,” “Hütte,” is חֲבִילָה; while the word for roof is חֲבִילָה. According to Dr. Thomson, the houses in that part of the country now are very low, with flat roofs, reached by a stairway from the yard or court. The roof consists of beams about three feet apart, across which short sticks are arranged close together and covered with thickly matted thorn-bush, over which is spread a coat of stiff mortar, and on that the marl or earth that forms the roof. Such a lightly built dwelling might well be called חֲבִילָה, for in the Targums this word is used, e.g. Isaiah i. 8, “as a

cottage in a vineyard"; Leviticus xxiii. 42, of the *booths* in which the Israelites dwelt during the Feast of Tabernacles; and Genesis xxxiii. 17, of the booths which Jacob made for his cattle at Succoth. Thus the difference between "roof" and "cottage" is one letter only.

The reader will doubtless be glad to know what light the primitive Gospel has to throw on the two expressions which have puzzled New Testament scholars so long. Luke says, *διὰ τῶν κεράμων*, "through the tiles," which seems to imply that the roof was tiled; whereas Mark's word, *ἐξορύξαντες*, "digging out," seems to imply a roof made of mud and lime of the sort described by Dr. Thomson. Are the words for "tiles" and "digging out" at all alike in Aramaic, so as easily to be confused? They are. The word for "digging," plural participle, would be *חֲפְרִין*; *פְּחָרִין* would be "tiles"; so that the transposition of two letters in an Aramaic text explains the entire mystery. If the reader will turn to our harmony, he will see *ὅπου ἦν*, "where he was," and *διὰ*, "through," standing on the same line. One Aramaic word for "through" is *בְּיָנֵי*, which also means "in the midst," and thus may very well have stood as the original of *ὅπου ἦν*, "where he was."

The description of the process as given by the two evangelists, diverse as it seems to us, may therefore be reduced to what is virtually the same Aramaic text with various readings.

MARK II. 4.

סלקו מללתא
בנו וחפרין
אחתו ארבעה
דעלוי משרי רביע

LUKE V. 19.

סלקו לממללתא
ובנו פחרין
אחתונה וארבעה

Thus much, then, as to the divergences which we think have arisen from inserting different vowels in the same Aramaic text-word. In our next article we hope to adduce

instances in which the divergence seems to have arisen from the fact that the common Aramaic word has two meanings, each of which is adopted by the several evangelists.

J. T. MARSHALL.

THE HOUSE OF GETHESEMANE.

AFTER having passed through twenty-five editions, the translation of the Holy Gospels which bears the name of M. Henri Lasserre has been condemned by the Congregation of the Index. Our Lady of Lourdes, invoked by the translator, has not succeeded in warding off the Roman thunderbolt; but the noise made by it was enough to call the attention of Protestants to a remarkable work which deserves careful study. Thanks to their new interpreter, the Evangelists speak the lively and forcible language of the present day; the style is modernized. The innovations are often characterized by elegant precision and scrupulous exactitude.

Our present purpose is only to bring forward a single detail: the expression *villa*, as applied to the garden of Gethsemane. In Matthew xxvi. 36, the version of M. Lasserre reads: "Jesus and His disciples entered into a villa named Gethsemani."

Villa is a term which M. Lasserre has taken as he found it in the text of the Vulgate. It appears in the dictionary of the French Academy as a synonym for country seat; but, in Latin, *villa* meant rather a country house, such as in Switzerland would be called a "campagne," without the notion of grandeur which attaches to the term country seat.¹ Moreover, in the parallel passage, Mark xiv. 32, the

¹ The Latin word *villa* was Italian before it passed into modern languages. According to the last edition of the dictionary of the French Academy, the word may be used in a more general sense for a simple country house. The

Vulgate has the word *prædium*, which more distinctly implies an agricultural tenure.

The Greek uses the term *khorion*, for which Grimm's *Clavis* gives precisely *prædium, villa*, in Acts xxviii. 7.¹

This translation seems to be necessary in the last mentioned passage. The received French versions render it: "Near to this place there were the lands of one named Publius, who was the chief person of the island," that is, the island of Malta. The expression "the lands" has been changed with advantage in the version of Rilliet into "the possessions." A provisional refuge was wanted for 276 wrecked persons; and their need was the more urgent as it was already the beginning of the bad season. Publius offered them, not lands, but farm buildings, which furnished them shelter during three months of winter.

It seems to us that the sense of *domain* would be near the mark in all the passages where Grimm renders *khorion* by *ager* and *fundus*, i.e. field, land. Jacob gave to his son Joseph a close, a rural property, not an open and undistinguished parcel of ground. Judas bought with the price of his crime a definite property, planted with trees, and situated near to Jerusalem.² Some of the Christians

definitions of Littré are a little different: 1. *Maison de plaisance* in the neighbourhood of the towns of Italy (Chateaubriand, *Mme de Staël*). 2. By extension it is used now all over Europe for an elegant country house newly built and of less pretension than a *château*.

¹ *Khorion* (χωρίον) in the LXX designates sometimes a vineyard, sometimes a stronghold. Rural estates were often surrounded with high walls and provided with a tower (Isa. v. 2; Mark xii. 1; Luke xiv. 28). The Hebrew New Testament of the celebrated Delitzsch translates *khorion* (χωρίον) by *chatzer*, חֲצֵר, a fortified inclosure. That of Salkinson, edited by Dr. Ginsburg, has *mekom gadar*, מְקוֹם גַּדָּר, a fortified place. The Hebrew word for garden (*kepos*, κήπος, John xviii. 1, 26) is *gan*, גַּן, from the verb *ganan*, גָּנַן, to protect. A "garden" therefore implies private property, needing special permission for a stranger to enter.

² Thirty pieces of silver were the price of a slave (Exod. xxi. 32, Zech. xi. 12). This sum may have completed the amount of capital amassed by Judas, partly by his robbery of the common purse (John xii. 6), with a view to his purchase. It would seem that although Judas had *bought* the field (Acts. i. 18) he had not

of the primitive Church sold town houses, some country houses, to put their value into the hands of the Apostles. The property sold by Ananias and Sapphira is called also *ktēma*, a country property, a rural domain. In any case Grimm, Schleusner, and Wahl agree in avoiding the indefinite expression "place" which appears in the French received versions, a faulty expression, since *khorion* in the New Testament has never the vague meaning of *topos*, place, spot. Luther, Lange, and Meyer have translated *khorion* by *Vorwerk*, *Hof*, *Landgut*, *Meierei*, indicating the meaning for which we contend. De Wette translates it by *Gut*, another synonymous word. Maldonat and Grotius speak of a *house* at Gethsemane. For once at least the Vulgate is found to be right, in opposition to the French Protestant versions.¹

The translation "country house" once admitted, one of the greatest difficulties of the Gospel of Mark vanishes. With what object does this Gospel mention, on the occasion of the arrest of Jesus at Gethsemane, a young man who, "having a linen cloth cast about his naked body," abandons that strange garment to the companions of Judas when they endeavour to seize him? (Mark xiv. 50, 51.) It has been thought that the young man was no other than the Evangelist Mark, he being the only one who reports the episode, which thus appears to have an autobiographic

paid for it, as we are told (Matt. xxvii. 3-10) that he returned the thirty pieces of silver to the chief priests, and that they afterwards completed the purchase of the Potter's Field.

¹ It is a curious fact that the French Roman Catholic versions have for centuries adopted the error on this point of the Protestant versions; but the Abbé Glaire (1863) translated the word "country house."

Another Roman Catholic author, the Abbé Michon, in his *Life of Jesus* (vol. ii., p. 45), states that "enormous olive trees, one of which is dying of old age, occupy the angle formed by the road to Bethany and the road leading to the top of the Mount of Olives. Here was the garden or inclosure. The dwelling house to which it belonged was probably somewhat higher on the slope of the hill." Any objection which might be raised in respect to the position as unsuitable for a villa, because low down in a narrow valley, is thus obviated.

character. So be it; but yet, why that peculiar costume? And what could be the use of a statement which, according to the celebrated commentator Meyer, seems to be purposeless? "That remains altogether unexplained," says the well known evangelical commentator, M. Louis Bonnet. Many persons have seen in the hero of this incident a mere looker on, or else an eccentric individual befooled by fright; but had it been curiosity or folly, the incident hardly merited the honour of narration.

In order, if possible, to solve this enigma, we have a preliminary remark to make. The "linen cloth" was simply a sheet.¹ Let us add that the Greek term *sin don*, in Sanskrit *sindhu*, in Hebrew יָרְדָּן *sadin*, refers to a tissue of great value. The vegetable product which was used in its manufacture was imported from India or Egypt. This furnishes an indication of considerable importance: the sheet of fine linen is, so to speak, marked with the name of the rich heir presumptive of the "villa."

The book of the Acts seems to confirm this supposition. We read there that John, surnamed Mark, had a mother called Mary, whose house, necessarily large and probably retired, served as a meeting-place for the persecuted members of the primitive Church.² There is a tradition that in this house took place the miracle of the first Christian Pentecost. When Peter is delivered from prison, he at once repairs to this dwelling, where "many were gathered together praying" (Acts xii. 12). Peter knocks, not ex-

¹ Eusebius the historian, in an enumeration, associates the *sin donai* (σινδῶνας) with beds and bed-coverings, *klinai kai strōmnai* (κλῖναι καὶ στρώμαλα).

² Acts xii. 12-17. According to M. Reuss, the Mark of the Acts and Epistles is "without the least doubt" the person who passes for the author of our second Gospel.—*Histoire Apostolique*, p. 138. "The house of Mary, mother of John Mark, was the ordinary and hospitable retreat of the Apostles when they were at Jerusalem (*vide* Cornel and Fromond, *hic*). Thither they retired after the Saviour's ascension; there they elected St. Matthias, and there they received the Holy Ghost. Some believe that it was in this house that our Lord was accustomed to lodge when at Jerusalem (Alex. Menoch, *Apud Sur. xi. Jun.*)."—Dom Calmet, *Commentary*, ad locum.

actly at the door of a house, but at the door of a gateway, *ten thuran tou pulonos*, which in Switzerland is equivalent to the "portail d'une campagne." This door opening in an outer wall or in a palisade, and separated from the house by an open space called *aule*, is the usual characteristic of a villa as distinguished from a town house. Rhoda, the door-keeper, who comes to answer the knock, returns running, *eisdramousa*, which supposes the gateway to be at a short distance from the house.¹ According to M. Bonnet, Peter probably knocked "at the door of the courtyard, or at a small door opening in the carriage gate." There is reference to another *pulon* connected with the residence of Annas and his son-in-law the high priest Caiaphas. Precisely at this epoch, according to a statement of the Talmud, the Sanhedrin had removed the place of its sittings to the *hanuioth* or bazaars of the Mount of Olives, the private property of the family of Annas. There was therefore at least one other "villa" in the outskirts of Jerusalem, not far from Gethsemane, the residence of the very highest family among the Jews. This shows the aristocratic character of the neighbourhood. "It was there probably that Jesus was taken and judged," says M. Sabatier in the *Encyclopædia of Religious Sciences*. Peter, leaving the court and passing through the vestibule, proceeds towards the *pulon*, or gate, when a second servant denounces him.²

¹ "Around and outside of the square formed by the portico there was a sort of front court, inclosed by a wall" (Stapfer, *Palestine*, p. 172). This wall made necessary the outer gate of which we speak. Within a city, the *pulou* (πυλῶν) was a portico, the ornament of princely residences. Such a luxury would be very rare *inside* a fortified and compact city such as Jerusalem.

² Matt. xxvi. 57-75; comp. Mark xiv. 66-68; *aule* (αὐλή) and *proaulion* (προαύλιον). According to the historian Josephus, the suburbs of the city were covered with parks and gardens (*paradoisais, παραδεισους*).—*Wars*, vi. 1, 1; cf. v. 3, 2. Titus, says Josephus, caused all these trees to be cut down for strategic purposes. The houses of the estates were entirely destroyed, and the materials served either to fill up the moats round the city or to raise platforms for the besiegers. This accounts for the fact that no remains of the house of Gethsemane now exist.

Our conclusion may now be perceived. Gethsemane was the name of a country house situated to the east of Jerusalem, on the other side of the Kedron, on the slope of the Mount of Olives, over against the Temple, and at a distance of less than a mile from the wall of the city. In the inclosure there was a plantation of olives, called *kepos*, orchard, in the Gospel of John, and an oil-press, in Aramæan, *Gethshemani*. The press had given its name to the whole estate.¹ This estate belonged to a rich dowager: Mary, mother of John whose surname was Mark.² The mention of the son to the exclusion of the husband, seems to indicate a widow. The mother and son together inhabited this residence. The prophet of Nazareth being a stranger in Jerusalem, Mary seems to have offered Him a shelter at Gethsemane. The door-keeper, perhaps that same Rhoda, or Rose, who later on came to answer Peter's knock, had received instructions to open the gate at any time, either to the Master or to His Apostles. Jesus often passed the night at this retreat. Luke tells us that He habitually retired in the evening to the Mount of Olives.³ But to what part of it? It was in the early days of April, or, according to other calculations, the beginning of March; it is scarcely to be supposed that at such a season of the year Jesus and His

¹ There still exists a clump of seven olive trees, at the place which bears the name of *Djesmaniyyé*. Riehm concludes in favour of the authenticity of the tradition relating to this spot. The actual inclosure, however, can only be a portion of the ancient estate.

² In accordance with a custom still subsisting among the modern Israelites, Mark had two names. He was known at Jerusalem under that of John. Mark was a surname of Roman origin, which might be used in preference in relations with non-Jews. It is possible that the father of Mark was a Roman proselyte who had married a Jewess. Saul of Tarsus took the name Paul soon after the beginning of his missionary travels in heathen lands (Acts xiii. 9). Like Mark, he may have had this name given him by his parents long before he substituted it for that of the Benjamite king.

³ Luke xxi. 37, 38; xxii. 39, 40. Comp. John viii. 1; xviii. 2. The verb *aulizomai* (*αὐλιζομαι*) does not necessarily signify to bivouac, or pass the night in the open air; in Matt. xxi. 17, it is used in speaking of the hospitality received by Jesus at Bethany in the house of Lazarus and his two sisters.

disciples would sleep in the open air. On the occasion of His last visit to Gethsemane, Jesus said to eight of His Apostles, "Sit ye here." The weather was cold.¹ Peter is shortly afterwards seen elsewhere suffering so much from cold as to approach a fire at the risk of being seized and condemned to death like his Master. "Sit ye here," seems to imply a place where the hours of the night might be passed without inconvenience; it might be a building separate from the house itself.² Jesus, Peter, James, and John remained in the garden, to "watch and pray."

Judas, the treasurer of the apostolic company, may have founded his plan of treason upon this combination of circumstances. If Jesus had been in the habit of passing His nights in the open country, the intervention of Judas would scarcely have been needed. The Pharisees, who were miserly, could very well have dispensed with a somewhat large outlay. Any police agent could easily have followed the track of the Teacher of Nazareth and seized Him; but to violate a private domicile was a much more difficult affair, and the more so as Jesus had devoted partisans who would have helped to defend the gate.³ An attempt to force an entrance might have provoked a riot, or even a revolution. By paying a traitor, this uproar was avoided. Knowing the retreat of Jesus and the means of introducing himself, Judas conducted thither a band composed of a detachment from the Roman garrison under the command of a tribune, with guards of the Temple, armed with their official staves. According to our hypothesis, the

¹ John xviii. 18, "It was cold."

² Dr. Edersheim supposes that it was the building in which was the oil-press. *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, vol. ii., p. 538. Olshausen says: "The disciples perhaps entered the house of the proprietor, who was one of their friends."—*History of the Passion*, ad locum.

³ Many of the Galileans who had cried Hosannah on the Day of Palms. The gardens near Jerusalem (κῆποι) were fortified by walls and moats; Titus nearly lost his life there.—Josephus, *Wars*, v. 2, 2.

Iscariot disposes this troop out of sight and then knocks at the "door of the gate," pronounces the password, and gets it opened. The soldiers and guards at once light their torches and lanterns, draw their swords, and press into the inclosure. Judas, going before them,¹ leads them to Jesus, who is already coming to meet him.

It was between eleven o'clock and midnight. The clatter of arms, the voices of the invaders, the shining of the torches awaken Mary and her son, who are surprised that it should have been possible thus to enter their premises in spite of the vigilance of the guardians. Without waiting to dress, Mark covers himself with a sheet from his bed and proceeds towards the troop. He sees that Jesus is being taken away. Strong in the sense of his proprietary rights, and therefore more courageous than the Apostles, who have abandoned their Master, he does not at first allow himself to be intimidated. Did he mean to intervene and to protest against this clandestine arrest? It is possible, and even probable. Be that as it may, he gives to Jesus a supreme mark of sympathy. He boldly keeps near to Him while John and Peter follow at a considerable distance. No one at the time sets a more noble example. As he goes along, however, he notices with alarm that the invaders are representatives of the established authorities. Suddenly he is seized, with the evident intention of making him a prisoner,² and he escapes by abandoning the sheet which he had used as a mantle. But he is not absolutely naked, *gymnos* in Greek and *nudus* in Latin may have a merely relative sense. When Jesus, after His resurrection, appeared to Simon Peter, who was fishing, Peter put on his mantle,

¹ Προήρχετο, Luke xxii. 47.

² According to the received text, he was seized by "young men." In that case, the attempt against Mark was only an escapade of young fellows; the soldiers and guards had nothing to do with it. Jesus, in giving Himself up, had stipulated that He alone should be taken by the regular agents of the public authorities.

“for he was naked,” as the text adds, as we should say, in working dress, in his shirt-sleeves. Peter wished to present himself to his Master in the complete costume required by social usage.¹

Mark was of a good family. His pious mother had provided him with an excellent education. Capable as well as zealous, he became ultimately the secretary and interpreter of the Apostle Peter, who calls him his son.²

Mark gathered from Peter some of those personal recollections which enrich his book. This precious document is, according to M. Reuss, the oldest of our Gospels; it appears to have been the fruit of a sort of joint authorship of Peter and Mark. The style recalls the impetuous temperament of Simon son of Jonas, and many a picturesque detail shows the work of an eye-witness. The Evangelist had a cousin in Barnabas, nephew of his mother, and himself a rich landowner. Barnabas took his cousin with him on the first preaching journey of the Apostle Paul. Mark had thus the special honour of being one of the first three missionaries of the Church. It is not known why he left his travelling companions on their arrival at Perga in Pamphylia. The narrative of Luke intimates that the motives of this separation were to a certain extent blame-worthy. It is possible that Mark, whose life had always been easy, drew back when faced by the fatigue and increasing dangers of the mission in a heathen country; he seems to be still the man whose intrepidity gave way at Gethsemane. Excuse has been made for him by supposing that ill news of his mother may have unexpectedly recalled him to Jerusalem at that moment. However that may be, Paul, on starting upon a second journey, refused to take Mark again. This was the subject of a sharp contention, *paroxusmos*. Barnabas, being a relative, showed more in-

¹ John xxi. 7. Comp. 1 Sam. xix. 24; Isa. xx. 2, 3.

² 1 Pet. v. 13.

dulgence; he took with him to Cyprus his cousin, who perhaps had, like himself, family connexions in that island. A few years later, we find Mark again in favour with Paul; the Apostle assigns to him a most distinguished position, and recommends him to the Colossians.¹

It is thought that after the death of Paul, Mark, who had remained with him, rejoined Peter in Asia; but if it be admitted that, in the First Epistle of Peter, Babylon means Rome, Mark did not leave that city. At last, according to Epiphanius, Eusebius, Nicephorus, and Jerome, he went to Egypt, where he probably founded the Church of Alexandria. His martyrdom is said to have taken place in the eighth year of the reign of Nero, some rioters having dragged him over sharp stones. But all this remains uncertain.

Let us return to the house of Gethsemane. Olshausen, Lange, and M. L. Bonnet have had a glimpse of a solution of the problem something like our own. M. Reuss has expressed himself thus: "It appears that Gethsemane was a special inclosure, with the proprietor of which Jesus and His disciples might be in relation. John calls it a garden, and the expression used by Matthew and Mark might be translated 'a country estate.' The end of the narrative of Mark makes it appear that the eleven apostles who accompanied Jesus were not the only persons present in that inclosure."²

We have not found anywhere the identification of the Villa of the Oil Press with the residence of Mark and Mary, but we have not met with anything opposed to it.³

¹ Col. iv. 10, *seq.*; Philem. 24; 2 Tim. iv. 11.

² *Histoire Evangélique*, p. 650.

³ These lines were written before we had read, in a recent number of the *Revue de Théologie et Philosophie*, an article by M. Combe on M. Lasserre's translation of the Gospels (p. 186). M. Combe recognises that Gethsemane may be thought of as the country house of Mary, mother of Mark. In accord with Theophylact, Klostermann supposes that Mark was the son of the

In the light of the foregoing, the episode of the young man in the linen cloth becomes as it were the signature of the Evangelist, a discreet signature, which attests the early affection with which Jesus had inspired His biographer, and which brings into special prominence the piety and hospitality of "Mary, mother of Mark."

In his *Biblical Studies*,¹ Prof. F. Godet has already mentioned this signature. He says: "We are strongly tempted to ask if the young man spoken of in the scene at Gethsemane, who plays such a strange and mysterious part, was not Mark himself; in accordance with the custom of painters, he puts in this way his signature to his picture, as Matthew has signed his in the narrative of the call of a publican sitting at the receipt of custom."

Every one must have observed the signature of John in John i. 40, xviii. 15, xix. 26, etc., and that of Luke in the pronoun *we* in Acts xvi. 10; some commentators have thought they have seen it also in Luke xxiv. 18. Our four Evangelists are more modest than Phidias, who dared to engrave his own portrait on the shield of Pallas Athene.

A signature is a proof of authenticity: in business it carries great weight. But we have here something more and better than an ordinary signature, which very often cannot be identified. There is, for instance, a legend to the effect that the original manuscript of the second Gospel has been preserved in the basilica of St. Mark at

owner of the house in which Jesus took the last supper with His disciples. He might have followed Jesus from Jerusalem to Gethsemane. We would observe that the costume adopted by this young man was scarcely admissible in the streets or suburbs of a city, while it is explained and justified by our hypothesis. As for Ebrard, he seems disposed to see in the young man in the "linen cloth" a servant on the farm of Gethsemane; this servant would be Mark, the author of the second Gospel. Ebrard thus approaches what we believe to be the true solution of the problem; but why suppose Mark to be a slave? We have had occasion to observe that, on the contrary, he occupied a high position in the social scale.

¹ *New Testament*, p. 40.

Venice. It is a relic so precious that it is never taken out of the treasury in which it is said to be inclosed. Supposing that it could be seen and examined, by what means could the signature of the Evangelist be verified?

A forger will imitate a written signature, while that which we have in view is inimitable; it is like the mark on the body, known to herself alone, by which after a long separation a mother recognises her child, changed by the nurse. In order to furnish the proof of authenticity contained in the incident under review, it would have been necessary to be fully acquainted with the private history of the narrator. A forger who should have invented this extraordinary incident would have been laughed at for his freak of imagination. Such an addition would have added absolutely nothing to the credit of his book. In order to inspire confidence in the first readers, to accredit the volume at the time of its publication, the anecdote of the young man in the linen cloth must have been already known to some well-informed persons; in other words, it must have been true.

If so, and if the interpretation that we have given of it is plausible, if we have succeeded in verifying the signature of Mark, it becomes evident that the author of our second Gospel was an eye-witness of the arrest of Jesus at Gethsemane. And more than that, this witness took an active part in the drama which he narrates; his name was Mark, and the narrative of the Passion has not been introduced into his book by a subsequent editor, as M. Reuss maintains.¹ Mark alone could have any interest in telling the

¹ *Histoire Evangélique*, p. 82, *seq.*, p. 87. M. Reuss explains why our two verses (Mark xiv. 50, 51) are omitted in the text of Matthew, but not at all why they figure in the second Gospel. If the young man in the linen cloth is not the author of the narrative, with what object does the Evangelist mention "a fact foreign to the history of the principal person, and of no interest to the Church in the absence of a proper name?" The insertion of an insignificant episode would be all the more incomprehensible, the narrative of Mark being distinguished throughout by a truly Roman brevity.

apparently futile story which relates to himself. The transparent veil of anonymity seems to establish the identity of the narrator with the hero of this incident. The author of the second Gospel was then a contemporary of Jesus. His signature attests the truth of the facts which are the common basis of our four Gospels. Our study of the subject has resulted in the confirmation of our faith.

E. PETAVEL.

PROFESSOR RAMSAY ON THE GEOGRAPHY
OF ASIA MINOR.¹

PROFESSOR RAMSAY'S explorations in Asia Minor are among the three or four best things done by Englishmen in the field of scientific scholarship in this generation. They will take rank by the side of Bishop Lightfoot's *Apostolic Fathers* and Westcott and Hort's *Greek Testament*, as work really of the first order, and of European reputation. More than one public body contributed to the undertaking. Prof. Ramsay himself places at the head of the list the Rector and Fellows of Exeter College, to whom his book is dedicated. I can speak freely of this because, although I have myself the honour to belong to that body, Prof. Ramsay's election had taken place before I was admitted to it, and the arrangements by which he was to hold his fellowship as a direct subsidy to the work of exploration were already complete.

It was one of the most far-sighted acts of any college within my memory, and one which has best justified itself by the result. But I fear that I must correct Prof. Ramsay on one point. He seems to think that his own was the first of a series of "research fellowships," to be continuously maintained. I wish it were so; but unfortunately, though the wish may be there, the power is absent. Since the date of Prof. Ramsay's election the revenues of the college have fallen so seriously, that, in spite of the generosity of more than one of its members, it is now all that it can do to

¹ *The Historical Geography of Asia Minor*. (Supplementary Papers of the Royal Geographical Society, vol. xviii.). By Prof. W. M. Ramsay. (London, 1890.)

provide for the bare necessities of its tuition. It is right that the public should know how much some of the older foundations are crippled in their resources; and that if they fail to show the same spirit of enterprise in the present as in the past, it should be set down to its true cause.

Besides the college, special acknowledgments are made to the Asia Minor Exploration Fund—which received powerful support from the Royal Geographical Society—the Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies, and the Ottoman Railway Company; and those who will run through the names of individuals to whom indebtedness is expressed in the preface, will easily see where the impulse came from. Let us earnestly hope, both that Prof. Ramsay may continue the work which he has so nobly begun, and that there may be others to share it with him.

It was a special piece of good fortune which led to the choice of the first explorer. It is clear that from the first Mr. Ramsay thoroughly grasped the situation. He knew what he ought to do, and he did it. It would not be easy to give a better example of the modern spirit than the volume which now crowns his researches. If any one is disposed to complain that “nearly 400 pages are spent in discussing a set of names of which nobody ever heard,” he is welcome to do so; but that is the way in which history must be written. I do not say that it is history, but it is the indispensable foundation on which history must be erected. The days of the old flowing narrative, which merely consists in paraphrasing the ancient accounts with a little balancing of one against another, are over. The true historian, whether his subject matter is civil or ecclesiastical, must sink his shafts deeper than this. He must get behind the formal histories; he must fill up their gaps, and discover what they do not tell him. He must set to work like the palæontologist, who reconstructs a vanished world from a few fragmentary fossils: so must he piece together such stray bits of information as he can recover; by a process of inference he must supply the parts that are wanting; he must first reconstruct his skeleton, and then he must let the breath of imagination breathe upon it, and not only clothe it with flesh and blood, but inspire it with life.

In order to do this systematically and scientifically, the first thing is to know the *terrain*; and never were the epithets “systematic and scientific” more deservedly applied than to the way

in which Prof. Ramsay has set about, first to understand for himself, and then to make others understand, the geographical conditions of the history of Asia Minor. He has gone straight to the heart of these conditions by grappling at once with the question of roads. What are the great lines of communication? What are the trade-routes? what the direction of military movements? what the course of the invader and of the merchant? When points like these have been determined, many a fact, and series of facts, which before had been obscure, will become clear and luminous.

If any one seeks an illustration of this, he cannot do better than make a careful study of the first part of Prof. Ramsay's book. He will see there how much may be made of a subject that seems at first sight dark and impenetrable.

We may say that there are four main instruments by means of which this may be done. In the first place, the explorer on the spot finds that the number of possible routes is often very much more limited than one who looks at the map only might imagine. Here a great mountain barrier, with a single cleft, through which traffic must inevitably pass; there a lake or a desert planted full in the way, and diverting the course to north or south; then a ford or remains of a bridge, which point to the crossing of some impetuous river. Given the objective, the two extremities of a road, and it will not be so difficult to determine by what stages those extremities must have been reached.

Next come historical documents. Maps like the so called Peutinger Table, which is traceable to an original of the fourth century, and the Antonine Itinerary; descriptions of pilgrimages; works of geographers like Strabo and Ptolemy; guide-books like the *Synecdemus*, or "Travelling Companion" of Hierocles, if the bare lists of which it is composed deserve the name; official lists of bishoprics or cities called *Notitiæ*; histories proper, containing the record of marches and campaigns.

Where sources such as these fail, ingenious use is frequently made of hints contained in names and the like: for instance, the fact that certain red earth brought from Cappadocia bore among the Greeks the name "Sinopic earth," proving that it was shipped at Sinope, and that the natural trade-route was from Cappadocia to the Euxine; ¹ and a similar name, "Synnadic marble," proving

¹ Page 28.

that Synnada was the emporium to which marble, which came from some little distance, was carried for sale and exported.¹

Last would come the great masses of material which can only be obtained *in situ*: the few remaining traces of actual pavement, remains of bridges, milestones, cuttings; and the inscriptions which serve to identify the cities and villages through which the road is known to have passed.

Of all these helps Prof. Ramsay has made an admirable use. By means of them he has been able to map out the great arteries of communication at four distinct periods: the prehistoric, when the people who are now frequently identified with the Hittites—though Prof. Ramsay speaks of them with much caution—had a great capital at Pteria (Boghaz Keui) on the Halys, with lines of route north and south, to Cappadocia, Cilicia, and Syria in one direction, and the Euxine in another; then the “Royal Road,” used for governmental purposes during and before the Persian period. I may commend to the reader a telling bit of argumentation connected with this on p. 27: “What was the reason why the Persian road preferred the difficult and circuitous to the direct and easy route? The only reason can be that the Persians simply kept up a road which had developed in an older period, when the situation of the governing centre made it the natural road.” Then we have the Roman period, when the proverb was true that “all roads lead to Rome.” Of course this could only apply in a remote sense to Asia Minor. What it meant was, that trade found its way by the easiest and most natural channels to the western coast, and the art of the great road-making nation improved the lines of communication which nature indicated. Asia Minor was now covered with a net-work of roads; but chief among them was the highway from Ephesus, up the Mæander valley, across southern Phrygia and Lycaonia, to the Cilician Gates. After Constantinople was founded—or, rather, from the time that Diocletian placed his capital at Nicomedia (in 292)—the centre of attraction changed; the trend of the lines was no longer due east and west, but north-west and south-east, pointing towards the corner of Bithynia which borders on the Propontis and the Bosphorus.

“A steady and progressive change was produced over the whole of Asia Minor. Previously prosperity had been greatest in the southern half of

¹ Page 54.

the plateau; but during the two centuries that elapsed between Constantine and Justinian the northern half of the plateau grew steadily in importance, as being nearer Constantinople and in easier communication with it, and many new centres of population were formed, which gradually acquired the rank of cities and bishoprics." ¹

The system was completed in the time of Justinian, and its main artery was the military road leading to the Halys. Along this the Byzantine and Saracen armies passed and re-passed for centuries.

These changes of route naturally carried with them a considerable shifting of population. Cities rose and decayed according as the great streams of traffic passed through them or left them on one side. To all this Prof. Ramsay is keenly alive, and he is no less alive to another series of changes which went on. Besides the larger re-arrangements and varying centres of density of population, there were also smaller changes of site, as the inhabitants of a fortress on the hills came down into the plain, or some city of the plain transferred itself bodily to the hills. An interesting example of a movement of this kind is supplied by the city of Colossæ, which, between the years 692 and 787, gave place to the fortress of Khonai.² Here the reason was military. The earliest cities were perched on inaccessible crags, the chief object aimed at being security; then during the long *pax Romana* a spacious and populous commercial centre would arise upon the plain; then again, in the period of Saracen and Turkish invasion, the safety of the hills would have to be sought again. But other motives also would be at work. Facilities of watering were a great consideration. In the better days of Roman civilization difficulties were surmounted by skilful engineering; aqueducts were boldly flung across the distance which separated a city from the springs which supplied it. But in time these aqueducts fell into ruins; there was not the energy, the skill, nor the money to repair them; and the consequence was that the population had to fall back to the water, and the houses clustered round the spring, while the more commodious site was deserted.

On a subject of this kind, where the facts are capable of being grouped under some broad generalization, the reader will find no lack of interest in the volume before him. It will hardly be ex-

¹ Page 74.

² Page 80.

pected that as much should be said for that large part of the work which is taken up with the minute identification of places and the accurate demarcation of provinces and districts; but this too is work which is most indispensable for the historian. And the greatest praise is due to Prof. Ramsay for the clearness and firmness with which he has, not only fixed the site of cities and villages, but also traced the lines of territorial divisions, which were constantly changing and being superseded.

The magnitude of the task will be appreciated when we look at the maps by which the volume is accompanied. In the first place, it is a pleasure to see that these, which are really worthy of the book, are of English execution. And then when they are examined it will be seen how much has had to be done. Compare them, for instance, with the historical atlases which are most in use, Droysen or Spruner, and the face of the country will hardly be recognised. Well may Prof. Ramsay say that "a great part of the map of Asia Minor must be revolutionised."¹ "In the case of Galatia, Pontus, Lycaonia, eastern Pisidia, and Cappadocia the ancient topography is quite unsettled. Only about one in six of the ancient cities have been correctly placed on the map."² Even Kiepert, to whom a just tribute is paid, has placed one *strategia* in Cappadocia a hundred miles out of its true position, so that the whole topography of Cappadocia is vitiated.³

This is, of course, assuming that Prof. Ramsay is right, and many of the questions which he discusses are no doubt matters of opinion. I can speak with no authority on the point; but I confess that his reasoning, so far as I have followed it, seems to be extremely weighty and deserving of the fullest attention. A great deal turns upon the estimate of the historical sources. A broad line is drawn between Strabo, Hierocles, and the Byzantine *Notitiæ*, on the one hand, and the Peutinger Table and Antonine Itinerary, on the other. Most recent geographers, notably Dr. Konrad Miller, the editor of the Peutinger Table,⁴ have sided strongly with the latter. Prof. Ramsay sides as strongly with the former. The question will have to be fought out, but I do not think an Englishman would do wrong in laying a wager on his countryman. He has had the great advantage of testing his

¹ Page 101.

² Page 51.

³ Page 100.

⁴ *Die Weltkarte des Kastorius* (1888).

authorities on the spot, with the fullest help from inscriptions and remains, and with the actual country spread out before him.

Two qualities stand out conspicuously in Prof. Ramsay's book. One is what the phrenologists used to call *causality*, a remarkable faculty for putting together cause and effect, for referring facts to general laws. In some forms of theorizing Englishmen, as a rule, are weak. A German will see six reasons where an Englishman will only see one; and a German will give you a choice of two or three systems where an Englishman is groping about for any system at all. But that certainly does not apply to Prof. Ramsay, or to the class of inquiry that he has undertaken. We feel that we are in strong hands; a vigorous judgment, completely master of its data, is the impression that is made upon us.

And another quality as marked is the spirit of *veracity* by which the book is characterized. Perhaps the amount of personal explanation is rather large; but one feels that it proceeds from a man, who claims his own, but is rigorously just in giving other people what is theirs. There is a refreshing absence of literary airs and graces. If the composition of the work bears traces of the difficulties under which it was written, that is a small matter. A plain, direct, vigorous statement of facts is what the author has set before himself. He may not be infallible, but he gives all his reasons, not trying by any rhetorical arts to make them seem stronger than they are. Every page of the book is workmanlike and to the point; it is wholly free from the diletantism which is the bane of so much of our work.

I will conclude by mentioning one or two *desiderata* which have struck me in reading the volume. First and foremost, I should very much like to see a special chapter on *monasteries*. There may be some good reason why so little is said, even incidentally, about these, but I feel sure that wherever it is possible to trace the history of monasticism in a country it is of great importance. What the centres of commerce and of government or the military stations are in one aspect of things, that the monasteries are in another. For many centuries they were the points from which intellectual and spiritual influence radiated; and the connected chain of monasteries marked the line for the passage of ideas. When Prof. Ramsay sits down to write his promised "Local History" of Asia Minor, I earnestly hope that monasteries may play a prominent part in it.

Another addition which I should have been very glad to see is a map of the middle strip of Phrygia, which unfortunately just escapes inclusion in the maps which are given us. The birth-place of Montanism, the home of Avircius, the scene of so much on which Prof. Ramsay has thrown light, cannot but have a peculiar interest. It is possible that a map of this district may have been published in some of the previous articles; but I have not been able to lay my hand upon it, not even in that most valuable paper on the "Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia." Prof. Ramsay should remember that in future we shall go to his volume in preference to any other authority.

Lastly, I cannot help wishing that Prof. Ramsay had given us a full and complete bibliography of his own writings on the subject of Asia Minor. Many of them are scattered over magazines that are not easily accessible, and it would be something to know at least where to look for them. It would be wrong to use the word "disappointment" in face of a work which must have cost such close and prolonged labour, but it would indeed be a boon if Prof. Ramsay could some day do what he seems at one time to have had the intention of doing in his present book, bring together in a single volume the data at present dispersed over many volumes.

When that was done we should see by what laborious and carefully constructed steps Prof. Ramsay has built up the edifice of historical knowledge: how he has begun by laying the foundations in a vast collection of topographical observations and epigraphical material; how he has then, as in the present volume, drawn with a masterly hand the inferences from these data, both particular and general; and, finally, we should see him, as in the series of articles in *THE EXPOSITOR*,¹ making the waste places of history live and blossom for us—showing us how in the north of Phrygia Christianity crept up silently among the rustic population of the valley of the Tembrogins; while in the south it spread in broader stream over the thriving commercial cities which lined the great high-road and the valley of the Mæander; resuscitating forgotten champions of the Church, like Avircius and Artemon; painting for us a picture such as we had never had before of the higher organization of the Phrygian Church; and, more recently, drawing from

¹ Third series, vol. viii. (1888), pp. 241 ff., 401 ff.; vol. ix. (1889), pp. 141 ff., 253 ff., 392 ff. Fourth series, vol. ii. (1890), p. 1 ff.

his treasures to illustrate the rising of the mob of craftsmen at Ephesus.

The student of the New Testament owes to Prof. Ramsay and his companions, not only the more exact delimitation of the Roman provinces and other local divisions in the apostolic age, not only the more complete definition of the network of roads which St. Paul must have traversed, but the settlement of some of the sites which he visited, such as Lystra (Khatyn Serai) and Derbe (Zosta).¹ The student of ecclesiastical history owes not a few interesting pages now written for the first time, and along with these the materials for a firmer grip and a better understanding of the vicissitudes of the Church in Asia Minor throughout the successive phases of its existence.

W. SANDAY.

¹ The proof of the identification in the case of Lystra and the first suggestion in the case of Derbe was due to the American traveller Prof. J. R. S. Sterrett, who served his apprenticeship with Mr. Ramsay (see pp. 332, 336, notes).

THE DESCENT OF CHRIST INTO HADES.

A CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN PROFESSOR FRANZ
DELITZSCH AND PROFESSOR VON HOFMANN.

[PROFESSOR VOLEK, of Dorpat, has published¹ the remarkable series of letters on theological subjects which passed between Professors Delitzsch and Von Hofmann, while they were colleagues at Erlangen between 1859 and 1863. The letters deal with a wide variety of topics, and the views of the writers are often in sharp antagonism; but the tone throughout is one of courtesy and affection. It was the wish of Delitzsch that the letters should be published; during his last illness he revised his own, striking out passages which referred to living theologians, and making other changes. The letters of Hofmann are left exactly as they were written. The most interesting part of the volume is that which deals with the descent of Christ into Hades, from which we make the following extracts. —Editor “*Expositor.*”]

DELITZSCH TO HOFMANN.

OUR theological discussion of yesterday evening is still running in my head. I took your *Schriftbeweis*, and read over once again the seventh section of the fifth doctrinal division, that which deals with the *descensus*. Towards the end you say: “We have said nothing as to the state of Jesus in death, except that it was a transition for Him into a

¹ *Theologische Briefe der Professoren Delitzsch und Von Hofmann, herausgegeben, bevorwortet und mit Registern versehen von D. Wilhelm Volek, ordentlichen Professor der Theologie an der Universität in Dorpat.* (Leipzig, 1891: Hinricks.)

communion with God, which was perfect as regards His whole nature. More than this Scripture does not tell us." This is a note which is struck more than once in your *Schriftbeweis*, and which, I frankly admit, always sounds to me discordant; for when I read that Scripture teaches "nothing further" or "nothing at all" as to this or that point, I am always sorry, first because it so greatly contradicts my desire as a man and a Christian; and, secondly, because it is counter to the impression of fulness of teaching, partly unfolded, partly meant for us to unfold, which Scripture always gives me. Our Lord's descent into Hades was, in your opinion, neither the lowest point of His humiliation nor the turning point of His glorification. Both of these you distinctly deny. It was only a transition, you think, to His transfiguration, and thus as closely related to His death as to His resurrection. But surely, if it was equally related to both, it must have been just as much the preparation for His resurrection as the completion of His death. Did it mean anything at all for Himself? If through death our Lord overcame him that had the power of death, and brought light and immortality to light through His resurrection, how can that which lies between, and is not His death itself, but His condition after death, have been only a transition and not also, considered in itself, an integral link in the chain of acts which formed the complete work of our redemption? If you reply that Scripture tells us nothing on the subject, I will concede that this is so, although such passages as 1 Peter iii. 19 and also Ephesians iv. 8-10 (cf. Col. ii. 15) appear to me to deal with the matter very definitely. If however we grant that these passages tell us no more than Acts ii. 24, still the duty is laid upon us as Christian thinkers of attempting, in the light which falls from the fact of Christ's death, on the one hand, and His resurrection, on the other, upon this other fact of His descent into Hades, which lies between

these opposite poles, to discover what is the significance of the descent into Hades in the work of salvation. It is in itself improbable that it was nothing more than the complement of His death. It is a transition, but in the sense of a *περιπέτεια*, a turning from *δέσις* to *λύσις*, against which the words of Peter in Acts ii. 24, which only give a brief summary of events, cannot possibly be urged in disproof. But even thus its significance is not exhausted. For the death of Christ is also the victory over death, and the resurrection is only the triumph. Therefore Christ's descent into Hades must have also been His victory over Hades; and for this reason the risen Lord carries the keys of Hades and of death, having triumphed over both.

It is true that the *descensus* none the less remains one of those mysteries of which least has been revealed. The remark in my *Biblical Psychology*, that 1 Peter iii. 19 was "clear as noonday" (a remark for which you reproach me, p. 473, and I blame you as little as I did my dear Von Zezschwitz in his work on the *descensus*) only meant that this passage is an *illustre testimonium* that the Lord did not enter Hades without proving Himself a conqueror over Hades. You understand it differently. I do not blame you, but I hope you will not charge me in the future as worshipping an idle *theologumenon* in my view of the *descensus*. For on the fact that my Lord and Saviour entered Hades I rest my hope that my path will not one day descend thither, just as His resurrection is a pledge to me that it will ascend to where He, the second David, has triumphantly ascended, and where He reigns at the right hand of the Majesty on high.

HOFMANN TO DELITZSCH.

YOU regret that I have nothing further to say as regards the state of our Lord in death, than that it was for Him the transition to a communion with God the Father, which was

perfect as regards His whole nature, and that I should find nothing further than this in the teaching of Scripture. This goes against your desire both as a man and a Christian, as do also similar remarks in other parts of my book, and my view is opposed to the impression of fulness of teaching, partly unfolded, partly meant for us to unfold, which Scripture makes upon you.

What fact within our knowledge did I set aside in the case before us when I used the sentence you mention? You think, above all, that when I say that the state of Jesus in death—for it is of that, and not of His descent into Hades, that I was writing—was as a transition to His glorification, equally related both to His death and to His resurrection, I admit more than the sentence you quote would imply. For it must have been a preparation for His resurrection, no less than the completion of His death. Certainly, in so far as His state in death was one into which He had entered by dying, like the human beings who had died before Him; and in so far, on the other hand, as the peculiar manner in which He was laid in the bonds of death (see my remarks on this point in my exposition of John xix. 34, 35) made His resurrection to a life of glory possible, and was indeed an introduction to it. Perhaps some minds may have a clearer idea or conception of the state of our Lord in death than I have attained. But do they gain any new material, any new knowledge, for faith to feed on? I scarcely think so. If I were writing a system of dogma, I should probably attempt to gain clearer views of the state of our Lord in death; but I should keep my conclusions strictly separate from the true material of a dogmatic system. To this belong only those facts of the history of redemption which, if proved false, would destroy the very foundations of my trust that through Christ I shall enter into loving fellowship with God.

Or must I discuss with you that which you do not find expressly considered in my writings as to the state of Christ

in death? You seem to think so, since you write that, if through death our Lord overcame him that had the power of death, and by His resurrection brought life and immortality to light, all that lay between must form an integral link in the chain of acts by which our salvation was secured. If this means that the Lord's state of death was *for us* (ὕπὲρ ἡμῶν), just as certainly as His death and resurrection, I of course agree with you. Only I do not find that any independent redemptive act took place during the time He remained in death, such as those of His death and His resurrection. That He did not only die, but entered into the state of all those who had departed this life from Adam onwards, and again that in this state of death He saw no corruption, but was reserved for His resurrection to a life of glory,—this has to do with my salvation, and my assurance of it. You think differently on this point. Speaking not of the state of Christ in death, but of His descent into Hades, you call the latter first of all the turning from *δέσις* to *λύσις*, and, secondly, His victory over Hades, as His death was the victory over death. I deny your first point, because the descent into Sheol was nothing more than His entrance into the company of those who were already dead; and you have no authority for taking Acts ii. 24 to mean more than that Jesus was in the bonds of death until, at His resurrection, the state of bondage in which death had not been able to hold Him came to an end. The sense of Romans x. 7 is just the same; for there the descent *εἰς τὴν ἄβυσσον*, to bring Christ up from the dead, is placed in such a connexion with the ascent *εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν*, to bring Him down from thence, that it is evident we may say with equal truth, He was in Sheol or in a state of death, and His coming out of Sheol is just as much one with His resurrection from death to a life of glory as His coming from heaven is one with His entrance into the life of the flesh. Against your other point, that the descent of Jesus into Hades was

His victory over Hades, in the same way in which His death was His victory over death, I have nothing to object, if your meaning is that which the comparison implies. The connexion is the same as when we say that His incarnation is our redemption. As we should not have been redeemed if the incarnate Lord had not died, we should be still in our sins and a prey to death and Hades if He had not risen. His entrance into Hades is the victory over Hades, because He enters as one who is about to rise, and whom the Father therefore preserves against the power of death and against corruption. Because He was dead, and is alive, He calls Himself (Rev. i. 18) the holder of the keys of death and of Hades, and not because, after He had become alive, He entered into Hades.

I cannot therefore see what I lose in respect of the facts on which faith rests in comparison with those who, like you, maintain a descent of our Lord into Hades which was different from His entrance into the state of death. But have I overlooked any teaching which Scripture offers? I do not think so. I set aside Colossians ii. 15, because I do not see that it has anything to do with the matter in hand. I do not see that Ephesians iv. 5-10 is relevant either; if, however, we are to understand *κατέβη εἰς τὰ κατώτερα μέρη τῆς γῆς*, not of the descent of Christ from heaven to earth, but of His descent into Sheol, still the passage has nothing to do with the point in dispute, and certainly does not imply that the descent referred to was different from His entrance into a state of death. 1 Peter iii. 19 remains; and as regards that passage, I will wait until those who think they see in it a reference to the descent into Hades have discovered an explanation of *κηρύσσειν* which would not be contrary to the *analogia fidei*. I wait all the more calmly, because I consider there is quite as much to be said for my own interpretation, so far as language and connexion are concerned, as for the other.

Where then is the full scriptural teaching which I overlook? I recognise the wisdom of Him who gave us the Bible in its silence on all matters which it is not needful for our salvation, or for our understanding of the ground on which our salvation rests, that we should know. The *μυστήριον τῆς εὐσεβείας* is indeed great, and its greatness consists precisely in this, that it is the *μυστήριον τῆς εὐσεβείας*.

DELITZSCH TO HOFMANN.

As we have begun to discuss the dogma of the *descensus Christi ad inferos*, it seems to me that, in view of the importance of this doctrine, we should not break off our discussion too soon. Permit me then to lay before you my conviction on the subject in brief and aphoristic form, as I have only a short hour of leisure this evening for writing.

Heaven is the place in which God reveals Himself in the unveiled glory of love. All through the Old Testament writings He manifests Himself there to supernatural beings only. Heaven is entirely empty of human beings, except that perhaps a seer in his ecstasy may be borne thither for a moment.

How different is the case in the New Testament! The apocalyptic seer beholds a countless multitude of blessed human beings before the throne. The resurrection has not yet taken place: but those who have died in the Lord are already seen in heaven as spirits, and as spirits in a state of perfection. There is even now a heavenly *ecclesia triumphans*. It is the body of those who have passed away in Christ which remains in a state of death, not their spirit, or (what is essentially the same) their soul.

In the Old Testament body and soul returned to the earth, and both were bound with the bonds of death. In the New Testament, on the other hand, the body is indeed laid in the earth, but the soul takes its flight towards

heaven. That the soul of one who here on earth has passed from death to life should, after its separation from the body, continue in a state of death is, no matter how pleasant we may imagine that state to be, contrary to the teaching of Scripture. The body alone has as yet no share in everlasting life, but the soul enjoys the treasure which here below it carried in an earthen vessel.

The total transformation of the final state of humanity is the work of the Redeemer. He died that He might indeed overcome the prince of death. The state of believers after death stands in closest relation to the state of the dead Christ Himself. The words of Peter (Acts ii. 24), that God raised Him up, *λύσας τὰς ὀδύνας τοῦ θανάτου*, do not mean that the Lord continued in the pains or in the bonds of death up till the moment of His resurrection. How could that agree with His own words, "To-day shalt thou be with Me in paradise"? In paradise there can be no suffering of the pains of death, for it is the place of the blessed, although not heaven in the meaning we have given it above.

The resurrection of our Lord was the loosing of the bonds of death only as far as His body was concerned, although even His body had not seen corruption. But to His spirit or soul there happened that which has made it possible for us to live the life of blessed spirits between our death and resurrection. His spirit was at once snatched away from death, so that He descended into Hades, not as a dead, but as a living spirit, while yet His body rested in the grave, waiting for its resurrection. Hades had no power over Him. He tasted death, but not beyond the "it is finished." If He had tasted more deeply, His body must have seen corruption, like that of Lazarus. He was a prey to *שְׁחַת* in the sense of *שְׁאוּל* (Hades) just as little as He was a prey to *שְׁחַת* in the sense of *שְׁחַת* (corruption). The words of David in Psalm xvi. 10 were fulfilled in Him in

the very sense in which they were meant by David. God did not leave His soul in Hades. But He descended into Hades, because His way to heaven of necessity led through the realm of Hades. Everywhere He established the new, while He fulfilled the old. And between His death and His resurrection He was in the state of one who, although He had not risen, was yet alive, that in all things He might have the pre-eminence. His descent into hell ended the reign of Hades for us, and created the blessed state of *πνεύματα δικαίων τετελειωμένων*, just as His resurrection is the foundation and the pledge of ours.

These remarks, which express my firm conviction, founded as I believe on Scripture, are only meant to give you an opportunity of expressing your views on matters in regard to which your position is not quite clear to me. To speak frankly, you appear to me to favour the view that our state after death is a kind of soul-sleep, and your teaching as to our Lord's descent into Hades seems to correspond with this. I should like to know how far you have been influenced in your views of the intermediate state by the glimpses given in the Apocalypse of heaven; in other words, whether we are agreed, that even now, when the resurrection is still in the future, there is in heaven a triumphant Church of blessed spirits, who not only rest under the wings of love, but are in fully conscious, active communion with the Lord and one another.

Do not be too brief in your reply to this, so that my doubts may be removed.

P.S.—Before sending you my letter this morning, permit me to remark, that those who have fallen asleep in faith may be called *νεκροί*, but, so to speak, *per zeugma*, because their body still awaits its resurrection. In the body they are dead, but in the spirit they live. Their spirits are be-

fore the throne, and serving God in His temple. There is no wilderness for our spirits between Egypt and Canaan. The words of the psalmist (cxv. 17) are no longer true in the New Testament in their original meaning, because our Lord descended into Hades, thus taking the first step towards His resurrection.

HOFMANN TO DELITZSCH.

I AM afraid we shall not come to an agreement on the subject of our Lord's descent into hell. I cannot conceive it to mean anything else than that our Lord יָרַד שְׁאֵלָה, which bears the same relation to the "descent" of those who died before Him, as His death bears to theirs. But you speak of Christ's descent as the first step to His resurrection; and of such a descent, which would be something altogether different from that of those who died before Him, I can find no trace in Scripture, nor can I understand how He could have died, and yet in dying not have entered into Sheol.

You escape from St. Peter's words (Acts ii. 24), which I quoted against your view, by asserting that if they imply that our Lord remained in the bonds of death until His resurrection, they would not accord with the promise He gave to the penitent thief. Allow me to point out, that, if this were so, the words would have no meaning at all. For the *σήμερον* of the promise would altogether exclude the idea of being bound in the bonds of death. The loosing of the bonds must in that case have taken place at the very moment when they were laid upon Him, and the word *κρατεῖσθαι* would be used in the sense of seizing, and not of holding fast. But how am I to understand your own opinion? After saying, that St. Peter's words cannot be taken to mean that our Lord continued in the bonds of death until His resurrection, you go on to remark, that His

resurrection *was* the loosing of these bonds, although only "as far as the body was concerned." If this is so, why might not St. Peter have meant that our Lord continued in the bonds of death until His resurrection, *i.e.* "as far as the body was concerned"?

You think then that Christ was in the bonds of death in the body only. His state after death would, according to this view, be a state of the body only, and He would not have died in the same sense in which other men die, whether those who fell asleep in faith before or after Him. For of the latter also we read, in Revelation xx. 4, that their souls become alive at the resurrection. These are the same souls that cry, "How long!" under the heavenly altar of burnt-offering (Rev. vi. 9).

As to whether I hold that those who have died in Christ are in a kind of soul-sleep, I need only point you to vol. iii., p. 182, of my *Schriftbeweis*. But my teaching with regard to the "descent into hell" has nothing to do with any opinion as to our state after death, but is founded, as I believe, on Holy Scripture, and is in strict correspondence with my conception of the history of our Lord Himself. I prefer accordingly to keep to the fact itself, without digressing to the question of our state after death.

I find that the Bible teaches that Christ, after He had become alive, whether with or without a body, descended into Hades. You however maintain that His spirit was delivered from death at the very moment of His dissolution, and that thus He entered Hades as a living being; He did not taste of death beyond the "it is finished," and was alive between His death and His resurrection. Do the words ἀπέθανεν καὶ ἔζησεν (Rom. xiv. 9) then represent two facts which occurred at the same moment? in His death did He pass into a state of life, by means of which His body also arose? Or do the words of Revelation ii. 8, ὃς ἐγένετο νεκρὸς, καὶ ἔζησεν, mean, "He died in the body,

but was alive in the spirit"? Or are we to understand ἔζησεν in both cases as referring only to the resurrection of His body? If this is so, I wonder why Scripture always speaks only of the death and resurrection of our Lord, and ignores altogether the fact which is incomparably more important than His resurrection, *viz.* His becoming alive immediately after death. I should have thought that our Lord's work involved His entering into the same state after death into which our sin had delivered us, only that, as I said in a former letter, He was reserved for His resurrection, which implied a distinction of state not only for His soul, but also for His body. Setting aside this distinction, I imagine that the state of Jesus Christ in death was like that of the beggar Lazarus. What Abraham and Abraham's bosom were to Lazarus, that Christ was to the penitent thief; with Him he finds himself in paradise, although he is in the company of the dead, not only as regards the body, but as regards the soul. If Lazarus could be in Abraham's bosom and at the same time in the bonds of death, the place where Jesus was might be the place of the tree of life, although He also was in the bonds of death. For, as I said, His state in death bore an equal relation to His dying and to His rising again, without necessarily being on that account a death of the body and a life of the soul.

For the rest I refer you to my former letter, which you have not yet answered.

DELITZSCH TO HOFMANN.

You remind me of the letter you sent me before the last. I did not answer it, because I do not wish to carry on one campaign after another with you. If I understand your character rightly, you are not one to be driven from your position by the arguments of an opponent. But your

opponent's ideas lie hidden in your mind like seeds, and if you were to revise your system, you would accept much that you formerly denied. I am therefore content to be the sower, and not to strive after victory in a duel with you.

Still, if you like, I am quite willing to return to your previous letter. In any case, we cannot yet pass from the consideration of these matters to others. They are infinitely important in themselves, and the discussion of them occupies no less than three not inconsiderable portions of the three volumes of your work.

First of all, let me say a word as to that which you yourself admit to be an important distinction in our way of looking at the words of Scripture. To come back to this general point once more is for me a necessity of the heart, and appears even a sacred duty. You draw a radical distinction between the assumptions of Scripture teaching and the conclusions which are drawn from it, and Scripture teaching itself. I utterly disapprove of this distinction. It rests on scientific, but not on biblical grounds. For as Scripture, according to 2 Timothy iii. 16, is profitable in all its parts *πρὸς διδασκαλίαν*, it must be instructive in every part and provide material for instruction. But you make it your business to narrow the instructive material, and to represent that which lies on the one side and on the other as extra-biblical current assumption or self-evident deduction. Is it only my feelings, or is it Christian sense and Christian conscience, which this method wounds?

In all three portions of your *Schriftbeweis* you begin by making a *tabula rasa* of all that might be called Scripture teaching on the points concerned.

In vol. i., p. 490, where you go on to consider the subject of our state after death, you begin by saying, "Little as Scripture teaches us about what it is to die, it teaches no more about the state after death." My whole mind revolts against this assertion. For I know without Scripture what

is the outward appearance of death, but of its nature I know nothing except from the Scripture. And as to the condition which awaits the man who dies out of Christ, and which awaited those who died before Him, I should know absolutely nothing definite, were it not that Scripture taught me. The idea of Hades does indeed exist as a popular notion outside the range of the Bible, but I should have no assurance that this idea is not a delusion, were it not that Scripture taught me. The Bible teaches even where it only assumes and deduces. It teaches both where it confirms that which could be learned without it, and where it draws conclusions from its own premisses.

In vol. ii., p. 473, you strike the same note, and assert that Scripture contains no doctrine as to the descent of Christ into Hades. From the fact that the Lord died, and rose again on the third day, we may indeed conclude that in the meantime He was in a state of death. But should we know without Scripture how to conceive of this state of death? I mean (because I am now setting aside our difference of view) that He was *ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ τῆς γῆς*, i. e. in Hades, but that notwithstanding this He was in paradise. Further, should we know without Scripture that He did not enter into the company of the dead, without producing an effect upon them, and what this effect was? I refer to your remark on p. 492: that the opening of the way out of death, which was proclaimed by the earthquake which rent the rocks and opened graves, was accompanied by the actual resurrection of certain holy men.

In all this Scripture teaches that in the time between His death and His resurrection Jesus was not (as one might be tempted to gather from a onesided view of Luke xxiii. 43) caught away in spirit to God in heaven, but was in the kingdom of death, yet not without signs of His living power, which proclaimed Him the conqueror of Hades. From your own argument in the *Schriftbeweis*, although

the existing doctrinal material is greatly reduced in volume, it follows that, even for you, Scripture teaches much more than is contained in the colourless sentence with which you begin on p. 473. That sentence gains colour and definiteness from the passages of Scripture which you then examine. Supposing however that, even without the witness of Scripture, you could draw these conclusions for yourself, every one has not skill for such a *gnosis*. Scripture unfolds its premisses for the *νήπιοι*, and this unfolding teaches us truths which, rightly considered, extend far beyond anything we could gather for ourselves.

In vol. iii., p. 462, we have the old assertion: no teaching as to the state of those who have died in Christ. And at the close of this section you explain (p. 488):

“All that we find to have any bearing on this matter is mere *self-evident* deduction from the spiritual fact of the new birth and the historical fact of the second coming of Christ in its connexion with the natural event of death; and the entire distinction between the state of Old and New Testament believers after death, which has come before us in the passages expounded, rests solely on the fact that the New Testament believers enjoy a communion with God which is really a communion with the Man Jesus Christ, who has passed through death to God and has been glorified by His resurrection.”

I know, dear friend, your deep reverence for the word of God, but I could not blame any one not so well acquainted with you who should think the word “self-evident” showed a lack of that humility we owe to the word of God, and of the decorum we should maintain in dealing with it. In one of your former letters you said, that all those facts which we believe have become known to us by the evidence of Scripture. It is not otherwise with that fact which you call “self-evident.” The enlightened understanding recognises indeed that it must necessarily follow from the great principles of redemptive work. But Scripture itself draws the deduction, and in doing so gives us doctrinal teaching no less than when it reveals the great principles themselves.

All the more does it teach us when it reveals the state of New Testament believers after death, not merely in general, but in many side-circumstances which we may not gather into the general idea. What will be the place in which the departed spirits and souls abide under the protection of the communion of Christ? Will their state resemble slumber? or will they be fully conscious and active both towards God and towards other holy beings. How will they find temporary compensation for the body which is yet wanting to them? Will they remember their life on earth? Do they know of the events which transpire in the world? All these questions Scripture answers; and in the answer gives us teaching which we should receive all the more gratefully, because we now possess a much more certain knowledge of those matters which it concerns us to know, than if the answer were left to be discovered by our own understanding, which, even when enlightened, is still only too capable of error. And in all cases where the things of the world to come are mentioned under earthly forms (as, *e.g.*, Matthew xxvi. 29), or are presented to the view (as, *e.g.*, Revelation v. 11), I find disclosures which, although it is impossible for us to translate them into the super-sensual, may still be viewed as object-lessons, which tell us more than the keenest abstractions of our discursive thinking. For John, the greatest seer, is in truth also the greatest theologian.

I am aware that the danger peculiar to my disposition is to find more taught in Scripture than it actually teaches, although I take pains carefully to separate my own possibly erroneous ideas from the definite points of departure laid down in Scripture. But in your whole work you are flying away from doctrine; and since you strive to bring the actual teaching of the Bible on the same level with your whole doctrinal system, many a solid piece of scriptural instruction falls a prey to your constantly renewed genera-

lizations. For instance, the whole *hierarchia cælestis*—archangels, seraphim, cherubim, etc.—are gathered up by you into the general conception of a multiplicity of spirits which work in the manifold powers of the corporeal world ; while I, when I hear the apostle distinguish between *ἄγγελοι, ἀρχαί, δυνάμεις*, etc., gather, in spite of my incapacity to understand these lofty matters, that there must be graded classes of these heavenly spirits. And in all your writings you have such a tone of certainty, that it almost seems as if you thought it impossible that you might be wrong. I know that this certainty is the natural accompaniment of your keenness of insight, the results of which I admire in the immense extent of the ground you cover. But, apart from the fact of salvation, of which our own experience is a pledge and guarantee, we know only in part, and even your keenness sees only *δι' ἐσόπτρου ἐν αἰνίγματι* ; and for this reason an admixture of scepticism, as I venture to think, would only serve to increase its value.

I draw a line here, for, instead of sending you the above as a separate letter, my criticism is going to hold you still longer. I know, even apart from this interchange of letters, that, along with that self-assurance which seems to me excessive, you have the gift of patiently enduring sharp opposition ; and from this it is clear, that your concern is for truth, and not for the fulfilment of your own opinions. In the letter before your last you say : “ It is on your own responsibility that you make Acts ii. 24 mean anything more than that Jesus was in the bonds of death until, at His resurrection, the bonds with which death had not been able to hold Him were loosed.” I answer, first, by referring to your own perfectly correct remark in vol. iii., p. 482, of your *Schriftbeweis* : “ According as the state of one who has died in Christ is considered in one or other con-

nexion (*i.e.* the spiritual or bodily) we find it distinguished as a state of life or death. The dead man is both with Christ in heaven and with the dead in Hades, as a disembodied *ego* with Christ, while his body remains in the kingdom of death." If I apply this to Christ, St. Peter's words, that God raised Him up, having loosed the bonds of death, are fully explained, by the assumption that, until His resurrection, He was in the bonds of death in the body, though not in the spirit.

I am quite willing to take upon myself the responsibility of thus limiting the sense of Acts ii. 24 (even in connexion with the quotation from the Psalm in ver. 27), for I am under the protection of an even more definite statement of St. Peter; *viz.* 1 Peter iii. 18-20. In proceeding to discuss this passage, I cannot conceal my pleasure, that your argument in the *Schriftbeweis* brings to light a great deal more scriptural teaching with reference to the *κατάβασις εἰς ᾄδου*, than your doctrine of the transitional character of the state of Christ in death might lead one to expect. For when you repeat these words of the creed in public worship every Sunday, "He descended into hell," the *benedictus* of pp. 489 and 491 of your work may come to mind in connexion with them: "Praise be to Him who through His descent turned Abraham's bosom into paradise, and in the midst of death revealed Himself to the dead as the Prince of life!" Relying on Luke xxiii. 43 and Matthew xxvii. 51-53, you also admit that Jesus did not enter Hades without effecting a change in Hades, and exercising His life-giving power upon the dead. I seem indeed to bring your inmost thoughts to light when I say, "The descent of the Redeemer made His exit from death possible; His resurrection made it actual; both together revealed it to the world."

When I consider how far we are agreed, I cannot share the hopeless view which is expressed at the beginning of your

last letter on this subject. In my judgment, the general root-idea of 1 Peter iii. 18–20, if we understand the passage as referring to the descent of the incarnate Lord, contains nothing to which you can object. I venture to go even further. If you could see your way to accept this passage as referring to the descent into Hades, you and I would be in a closer agreement than I have been able to form with Wiesinger, Von Zezschwitz, and Von Öttingen. For I cannot accept the Lutheran view—opposed to the Roman Catholic on this matter,—although it has the authority of Thomasius, and was sanctioned by an anathema of the Council of Constantinople in 381; *viz.* that the *reductio animæ et corporis* preceded the *descensus*, and that we should thus distinguish between two *descensus*, one being the natural consequence of death, and the other the prelude of resurrection. I prefer to adopt the view which obtains in the Greek Church, according to which the spirit (or soul) of Christ, personally united as it was with the Divine nature, is considered as the subject of *descensus*, and I agree with your remark on p. 474: “The words which follow ἐν ᾧ πορευθεὶς ἐκήρυξεν refer to a preaching on the part of Christ in which He used the medium of spirit rather than of flesh; and we are not told that He went and preached in the state which is indicated by the words ζωοποιηθεὶς πνεύματι.” I also quite agree with your preceding remark, on the antithesis θανατωθεὶς μὲν σαρκὶ ζωοποιηθεὶς δὲ πνεύματι; namely, that the life He had resumed, and which was now held under spiritual conditions, must be understood as belonging to the entire Man Jesus, both as regards His body and His soul. The ζωοποίησις which the apostle means would thus be one and the same with ἔγερσις and ἀνάστασις. I maintain only that our Lord, having descended into Hades, manifested Himself ἐν πνεύματι to the spirits in prison, and that (in Güder’s words) this spiritual (not yet bodily) self-manifestation is a point of special importance in the perfecting

process by which the Divine-human person of Christ attained the form of the *σῶμα τῆς δόξης* which alone was adequate for it. For I admit that you are right, in thinking that *ἐν ᾧ* relates more nearly to *ἐκήρυξεν* than to *πορευθείς*, since the words are not *πρὸς τὰ ἐν φυλακῇ πνεύματα*, but *τοῖς ἐν φυλακῇ πνεύμασιν*. This *πορευθείς*, *i.e.* evidently *εἰς ἕδου*, is equivalent to *καταβὰς εἰς ἕδου*, and (as Thomasius has shown) the antithesis to *πορευθείς εἰς οὐρανόν* (ver. 22); for *ἕδου* (*φυλακῆ*) and *οὐρανός* are polaric opposites.

You still maintain however that the apostle is speaking of Christ's preaching *before* His incarnation to the race that perished in the flood. In recommendation of this view it must certainly be granted that you do not hold it alone, for Wiesinger quotes a long list of expositors (p. 228) who maintained it also. And the problem as to why it was precisely the generation that perished in the flood that heard the preaching in Hades is solved by this theory simply because it is set aside altogether. That is the very purpose of the interpretation. It does not take the text of Scripture frankly as it stands. It cuts the knot; but the solution is altogether incredible, whether we consider the language or the subject matter.

When the apostle says, "Christ went and preached unto the spirits in prison," he means (unless we suppose that he makes use of language to conceal, rather than to explain his thought) (1) that Christ went to the abode of these spirits; and (2) that He preached to them on that very spot. And when he adds *ἀπειθήσασί ποτε ὅτε, κ.τ.λ.*, he describes these spirits more minutely, telling the cause of their imprisonment and the motive of the preaching that was addressed to them. The word *πότε* places their disobedience in a past lying on the other side of the *ἐκήρυξεν*: "the spirits in prison which in time past were disobedient," etc. It is true that *ἐκήρυξεν ἀπειθήσασι*, taken by itself, might mean, "He preached, but they did not obey"; but

the *πότε* makes it impossible to assume that the preaching and the refusal to obey occurred at the same time, in which case the word would have been *τότε*. The aorist participle undoubtedly takes a past-perfect meaning from the word *πότε*.

But if we look at the sense of the passage, it is equally impossible to consider the preaching as having been "a message of Christ during the 120 years of grace to the generation of the flood." Preaching is a personal action. But Jesus Christ is pre-existent in Old Testament history only in Jehovah the God of redemption, whose purpose it is to become incarnate, and in the angel of Jehovah, who, as a manifestation of God, is Himself a pre-revelation of the incarnation. This is the explanation of such sayings as that Isaiah saw Jesus Christ (chap. vi.), that the spirit of Christ was in the prophets; that Moses chose the shame of Christ rather than the treasures of Egypt; that Christ was the rock which followed Israel: for the rock, out of which Israel drank in the first and again in the fortieth year after the exodus, was, spiritually interpreted, the presence of the God of salvation, who is in truth *צִוֵּר יִשְׂרָאֵל* (*צִוֵּר*). You and I agree that Christ was *not* otherwise pre-existent in Old Testament history than in Jehovah, who had the incarnation already in view. Granting this, the interpretation that Christ, who was put to death in the flesh, but raised in the spirit, went in the spirit and preached to the spirits of those men who were alive in Noah's time, but who are now in prison, appears to me altogether unwarrantable. In the first place, it is strange that Christ should have been the subject of preaching which warned them of the impending judgment, but had no connexion with God's plan of salvation which was fulfilled in the future life of Christ. Next, Genesis vi. throws no light on the Christological idea of the apostle, is contrary to the universal rule, when Old Testament facts and sayings are referred

to Christ; there is not even a reference to a descent of Jehovah, which might explain *πορευθείς*. In the third place, we might have expected that in this mention of the preaching as the act of Christ, the human instrument would have been named; but, as if in direct defiance of this interpretation, Noah is only incidentally alluded to in ver. 20. And, lastly, the prophetic preaching of the Old Testament might be cited as that of the *πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ* witnessing to itself; but why the apostle should have gone so far as to look upon this Noachic preaching as the personal action of Christ *ἐν πνεύματι* is to my mind quite incomprehensible.

The question now arises, What was the nature of the preaching of Christ in Hades? Von Öttingen gives an answer to this question in his treatise *De Peccato in Spiritum Sanctum*, which is perhaps the wisest word he has said in this connexion: "Christus *κηρύσσων* non potest nisi se ipsum prædicare." There is here, so far as I see, no risking of the *analogia fidei*; for the reference is to men who died before Christ, and for whom, so far as they were capable of receiving salvation, the self-revelation of Christ in Hades did exactly the same thing that great deed of the resurrection of all who have fallen asleep in Christ does (according to a fine passage in *Weissagung und Erfüllung*) for the other great multitude of the dead.

The further question occurs, Why was it precisely the generation of the flood to whom Christ preached? I believe that you could answer this question better than I, if you would only seriously attempt to deal with it; for you are a master in the art of discovering and stating with precision the connexion of the chain of ideas. The apostle, as it seems to me, passes from discussing the Christian duty of willingness to confess and to suffer to speak of Christ, the great pattern of both. He points to Him who suffered the just for the unjust, and who did not neglect to preach, *i.e.* bear witness of Himself, even to the race who for their

stubborn disobedience perished in the flood; to Him who, after suffering death and descending into Hades, entered as the risen God-Man on a life of Divine glory in heaven, transcending even that of the angels. It seems to me that some such answer to the question why the generation of the flood, to which he refers elsewhere in his epistle, should be specially mentioned here. But even granting that these two questions must remain as insoluble riddles, to my mind there can be no doubt whatever that, to the mind of a candid expositor, the apostle's words can refer only to a proclamation of Himself made by Christ in the intermediate state, in Hades, and before His resurrection. In vers. 18-22 the apostle passes in review all the phases of the existence of our Lord, from His passion to His throne.

THE BLADE OF GRASS.

“He will pass away like the blade of grass; for the sun arose with a scorching wind, and withered up the grass, and the flower thereof fell off, and the grace of its form perished. So also shall the rich man be blighted in his ways.”—
JAMES i. 10, 11.

ST. JAMES plays the fabulist, or historian, in these verses, and narrates the sad end of a certain blade of grass. He warns the rich man that he will fade and perish like this blade of grass; and in the Greek, throughout the warning, he uses the historical tense, the *past* tense. His words should be rendered “the sun *arose* and *scorched up* the grass,” not “the sun *rises* and *scorches* up the grass”; “the flower thereof *fell* off,” not *falls* off”; and “the grace of its form *perished*,” not “*perishes*.” Obviously he is narrating a past event; he is telling the story of a certain famous blade of grass, which grew, flourished, and withered away, long before he wrote.

In whose field then did this grass grow? All the commentators reply, “In that of the prophet Isaiah.” St. James is here falling back on Old Testament words which would be familiar to the Jews for whom he wrote, words which his story would be sure to recall to their minds, though they may not immediately recall them to ours. So that before we can fully enter into the apostle’s meaning we must consider the words of the prophet. In short, our subject naturally divides itself into (1) the Story of the Blade of Grass, and (2) the Moral of that Story.

1. *The Story of the Blade of Grass.* In Isaiah xl. 6–8, we find these words: “All flesh is grass, and all the goodliness thereof as the flower of the field. Grass withers, flowers fade, when the breath of the Lord bloweth on them. Surely the people are grass. Grass withers, flowers fade; but the word of our God will stand for ever.”

Now we can hardly listen to these words without be-

coming conscious of a certain tender beauty in them. It is not simply that their leading thought, the transitoriness of human life, is in itself a most pathetic thought; but the words seem to set themselves to a plaintive music, and the refrain, "Grass withers, flowers fade," goes singing through our brain in mournful numbers, quickening pathetic memories of beauty blighted, wounded affection, "the tender grace of days that are dead," the bright but broken promise of defeated hopes, the clear, happy dawn of lives soon clouded in disastrous eclipse or quenched in the darkness of death. As we listen to the prophet, imagination stirs and works; we *see* the broad, pleasant field bathed in sunlight, fanned with sweet airs, thick with verdant grass, gay with the purely tinted, fragrant wild flowers which clothe the grass as with the robes of a king; and then we feel the fierce, hot blast sweep across the field, under whose breath the grass withers, the bright flowers fade, and all that teeming life, all that exquisite and varied beauty, is swallowed up of death. Who does not feel at times that *that* is a true picture of human life? Who does not feel that the very moment we detach ourselves from the throng and lift our thoughts to the height from which alone it can be truly seen, how brief our life is, how frail, how transitory; that the generations of men rise, and fall, and pass away, just as the grass springs and withers, just as the flowers bloom and fade? And remembering how, in *this* field, every separate blade of grass and every fragile flower has its own little world of hopes and fears, joys and pains, who can fail to be saddened as he beholds them withered by a breath, their early promise unfulfilled, their goodness not ripening to its maturity?

Touching and beautiful in themselves, as an exquisite expression of a most pathetic fact, these words take new force so soon as we connect them with the circumstances in and for which they were spoken. The prophet Isaiah,

whose main duty hitherto had been to denounce the judgments of God on the sins of Israel, to foretell that bitter captivity in Babylon which seemed to strike a fatal blow at all the Hebrew hopes, now receives a new series of visions, a new and happier duty. The eternal Spirit carries him on to that distant point of time at which the Jews shall have reached the term of their captivity, and will start on their return across the sands and the rocky defiles of the intervening "desert" to their native land. He is to "speak comfortably" to them, to assure them that their iniquity is pardoned, their sin put away, that the years of their bondage are told and gone. As the prophet broods over the vision with a joy too deep for words, the silence is abruptly broken as by the voice of a trumpet—"Hark! a herald!" In the herald he recognises the servant and ambassador of the great King. Another message of comfort has come to him from heaven. And the message, delivered in the curt, imperative tones of the herald, is: "Prepare ye a way for Jehovah in the wilderness; make smooth in the desert a highway for our God. Let every valley be raised, and every mountain be levelled; and let the rough places be made smooth, and the rockledges a plain; and the glory of the Lord shall be revealed, and all flesh see it." This divine proclamation teaches the prophet to look for the return of the exiled Jews under the form of a royal progress. The great King, followed by His hosts, is about to cross the wilderness which lies between Babylon and Jerusalem. To prepare the way before Him and them, the valleys must be filled up, the rough, difficult gorges must be made smooth, rocks and hills be levelled with the plain. When the royal highway is ready, the King will come, His subjects in His train, and there shall be so wonderful a display of the divine Majesty and Grace that "*all flesh* shall see it," even to the ends of the earth. In other words, whatever hindered, or threatened to hinder,

the emancipation and return of the Jews from Babylon should be taken out of the way, and all the perils of their passage through the desert be happily overcome.

The herald having delivered his message, there is once more silence in the prophet's soul. But again the silence is broken, and he cries with deepening wonder, "Hark! a Voice!" and now it is the voice of the great King Himself. It arrests the feet of the departing herald with the command "Cry"; *i.e.* proclaim. But the herald has discharged his commission: he has nothing more to proclaim. In his embarrassment he turns and asks, "*What shall I cry?*" And the divine Voice replies: "*All flesh is grass, and all the goodness thereof as the flower of the field. Grass withers, flowers fade, when the breath of the Lord bloweth on them. Surely the people are grass. Grass withers, flowers fade; but the word of our God will stand for ever.*"

The first proclamation had closed with the promise that the glory of the Lord should be so signally displayed that "*all flesh*" should see it; that is, all the great heathen world. The second proclamation commences with "*all flesh is grass*"; the great heathen world, stable and imposing as it looked, was transient; all its bravery would wither beneath the breath of the Lord, like the field of grass before the hot blast of the desert.

These surely were very "comfortable" words for the Jews. To them it could not fail to be good tidings of great joy to hear that the vast heathen empires, by which they had been so cruelly tortured and oppressed, were but as grass; to hear that God so cared for *them*, a few poor thousand captives, that He would "blow upon" the massive and enormous kingdoms of the East, and cause them to wither away in His anger. In such a message as this they would exult and rejoice. But they must not forget that they too are men, that they too are frail and transient in themselves, that they can only endure as they fashion them-

selves on the word of God, which endureth for ever. And therefore the herald was to repeat and vary his message. "All flesh is grass"—all the great heathen races; but also "this people is grass," a grass which withers like the rest. Like their neighbours, the Jews were in a constant flux, vexed by constant change. One generation came, and another went. Their life, vexed with perpetual changes while it lasted, never continuing in *one* stay, was soon over and gone. Their only hope lay in obedience to the divine word, in appropriating that word, in steeping their life in it till it became enduring as the word itself.

This then is the noble passage which St. James had in his mind when he told his story of a certain famous blade of grass that had been scorched by the heat of the sun, till the flower thereof fell off, and the grace of its form perished. He was thinking of the field which Isaiah had depicted centuries ago, of the grass which grew in it and had long since withered away; of the mighty Babylonian empire which their fathers held to be as solid and enduring as the mountains, but which had now sunk into a mere heap of ruins; of the generation which had returned to Jerusalem, with joy upon their heads, to recommence a national life which was now fast drawing to a close. All these had passed and gone; they had withered like grass, faded like the flowers that clothe the grass; the place that had known them would know them no more for ever. And thus, by recalling the history of the past to his readers, the holy apostle gave new force to his warning on the frailty of human life, the instability of worldly fortune.

2. Here then we come on *the Moral of this Story*. St. James is not content with a lesson so large and general as had contented Isaiah. He has a special and more definite purpose in view in telling the story which called up memories, prophetic and historic, from the past. As he had taken a single blade of grass out of Isaiah's broad field,

so he selects one man, or one class of men, for special warning. The blade of grass reminds us that human life soon withers, that human fortune often withers even before the man dies. Yes; but it also reminds us that some men wither even while they retain the full vigour of their life, and their good fortune abides. *The rich man* "withers in his ways," in his goings to and fro along the lines of his traffic, before his health is touched, before his wealth is touched. And therefore, argues St. James, the rich man should rejoice when his riches use their wings and fly away. The alternative the apostle places before him is this: Let the wealth wither that the man may live, or let the man wither amid the abundance of his wealth.

'Tis a hard saying! but, before we reject it as too hard for practical use, let us clearly understand what it means. James had just said, "Let the brother of low degree rejoice in that he is lifted up, but the rich in that he is brought low." And, as we have seen, we are bound by every sound canon of interpretation, and by the whole scope of the apostle's argument, to take these terms in their plain, literal sense. The poor man is to be glad when he is tried by riches, and the rich man is to be glad when he is tried by poverty. St. James is arguing that trial, and trial of the most searching kind, is good for every good man, that it helps to make him perfect, that it prepares him to receive the crown of life. And because great reverses of fortune are among the severest tests of character, he would have the poor good man welcome wealth, and the rich good man welcome poverty.

Now, however much we may dislike the injunction, or part of it, can we deny that it is based on a true, on a Christian, view of human life? Are not sudden and large reverses of condition severe and searching tests of character? Does it not take a very good poor man to ride straight to God when he is set on horseback, and a very good rich man

not to "break down" when he is "brought low"? We may not fear riches for ourselves, but do we not fear them for our neighbour? If a poor brother suddenly becomes rich, are we not afraid that he may grow worldly and self-indulgent and "stuck up"? If he bear *this* test well, if he retain his humility, his soberness, his spirituality of mind, do we not account him capable of meeting almost any test by which character can be tried? On the other hand, do we not fear poverty for ourselves and for our friends? If a rich brother, reduced from affluence to penury, is no more ashamed of his penury than he was proud of his affluence; if he is patient, content, cheerful, as, with failing strength, he addresses himself to new, difficult, ill-remunerated toils, and can greet with a smile the swallow-flight of friends who valued him only for what he was "worth" to them, do we not pronounce him a well nigh perfect man?

So far as this then we must admit St. James to be right. Great reverses of fortune *are* very searching and conclusive tests of character. And can we expect a Christian teacher to bid us grieve over any reverse by which our character is tested, matured, perfected? In the Christian view of life *character* is of supreme importance; circumstances, easy or uneasy, are of value only as they serve to form, purge, elevate, and strengthen it; for on the character we form our welfare, here and hereafter, depends. No doubt wealth is very pleasant if we can use it wisely, and poverty very unpleasant if we have not learned to bear it well and to get from it the good which God intended it to yield. But what is infinitely better than either is that true manliness which makes us equal to either fate, that true godliness which enables us to welcome any condition, any change that will strengthen us in virtue, in goodness, in charity. The wealth and the poverty will soon pass, but the character will remain, and will determine our destiny.

Therefore it is that the wise man says, "Whatsoever is brought on thee take cheerfully, and be patient when thou art brought to low estate; for gold is tried in the fire, and acceptable men in the furnace of adversity." And therefore the inspired apostle says in precisely the same spirit, "Let the brother of low degree rejoice when he is lifted up, but the rich when he is brought low."

Does any one object, "It may be easy enough for a poor man to be glad when he gets rich; but how is a rich man to rejoice when he becomes poor? You ask too much of us, more than it is in man to give." I reply: "You are not speaking, and you know that you are not speaking, from the Christian point of view, in the spirit of Him who, when He was rich, for our sakes became poor. You are putting circumstances before character, transitory gains and pleasures before abiding and eternal realities. Nay, you are not speaking from your own best selves, and your own highest point of view; for the very men whom you most admire are not the men who put money first, or any kind of gain or pleasure, but the men who put God first, and duty, and truth; and the moments in their lives which you most admire are precisely those in which they sacrificed their personal interests to the common good, or preferred the cause of truth and righteousness to all the joys and gifts of the world. And what do you admire them for save that you may imitate them?"

But if any one should plead, "It is surely *very hard* to be honestly and sincerely glad, to count it all joy, when loss and pain come upon us": what can any man, with a heart in his breast, reply but, "Yes, surely it *is* very hard, so hard that we shall never do it except as we possess ourselves more and more fully of the Spirit of Christ and of God, and receive grace on grace. Heaven is very high: how are we to reach it save by climbing? It *is* most difficult to raise these frail, sinful natures of ours into the

noble characters of immortality: but does a difficult task grow easier because we shut our eyes on it, or if we either neglect or postpone it?"

St. James himself felt that the latter half of his injunction was hard to flesh and blood; in demanding that the rich man should rejoice whenever he is brought low, he felt that he was imposing a very severe test on character, a very heavy strain on virtue. And that, I suppose, is why he told his story of the blade of grass, to which at last we come back. What he meant was I think to this effect: "You remember the prophet Isaiah's field of grass, and how it withered beneath the scorching heat, so that the flower thereof fell off, and the grace of its form perished. The rich man is often like a blade of that grass. The sun of prosperity shines on him more hotly than he can bear; all the promise and beauty of his nature fade beneath the scorching heat; he withers in his ways, in the multitude and perplexity of his schemes and pursuits: his fortune grows, but *the man* decays, dies before his time, dies even long before he ceases to breathe and traffic."

Is not that a true picture, and a sad one? All flesh is as grass; we must all needs die; and this fact is sad enough in some of its aspects; but it is sadder still that many of us should be as grass which *will* expose itself to the heat it might escape, which will tolerate no cloud, welcome no cooling wind, and fades and dies while the rest of the field is still green and fragrant. Yet do we not all know men who give themselves to the mere task of accumulating wealth with a devotion so excessive that in very deed *the man* does die out of them long before they die: men who neglect the duties and charities of home, put aside all that makes life fair and graceful and noble, repress their spiritual energies and affections, and hardly give a thought to heaven, or to the kingdom of heaven, till they have utterly unfitted themselves to enter it? As you watch them year by year,

do you not see them growing more and more sordid and unspiritual in their aims, with a fiercer greed for gain, with fewer scruples as to *how* they get it, their tasks and schemes so multiplying on their hands, so incessantly occupying and taxing their powers, that they have no leisure, no taste, for reading, for thought, for prayer, for aspiration, for any but a purely doctrinal or a purely formal religion, if any profession of religion be maintained? Are *these* spiritual creatures in training for an immortal life? Nay; they are rich men *withering away in their ways*, merging and losing themselves in their affairs.

Douglas Jerrold, one of our keenest wits and satirists, has depicted "a man *made* of money." He had only to put his hand into his breast to find it full of banknotes; but as he draws away note after note, he drains away his vitality; he dwindles and pines amid his vast schemes and luxuries month by month, till he wastes into a mere shadow, till the very shadow disappears. The picture is hardly a satire, it is so mere a commonplace. Every day we live we may see men *dying of wealth*, all that is manly, all that is fine and pure and noble in character, perishing as their fortunes grow. On every side, in every field, we may see St. James's blade of grass withering beneath the heat of the sun, its flower falling, its grace perishing.

The warning comes home to us in this age as in few previous eras of the world; for our whole life is so rapid and intense, our business is such a strenuous and exhausting competition, we are solicited by so many schemes for our own advancement, or for the good of the town in which we dwell, or for the benefit of the commonwealth of which we form part, that it is almost impossible to make leisure for thought, for a quiet enjoyment of what we have gained, or for those religious meditations and exercises on which our spiritual health in large measure depends. We are literally *withering away in our ways*, so many are the

paths we have to tread, so rapid the pace we have to maintain, so scorching and tainted the atmosphere we breathe. And hence, whether we are rich, or seeking riches, or are labouring with anxious and fretting care for a bare competence, we all need to take heed to the warning which speaks to us as to *men*; i.e. as to spiritual and immortal creatures, children of God and heirs of eternity. If we would not suffer this world, which holds us by ties so many, so strong, and so exacting, to crush all high spiritual manhood out of us, we must set ourselves to be in this world as Christ was in the world. He neglected no duty, refused no innocent delight, loved, when He could, to sit at feasts, with friendly faces round Him and good fare on the board, insomuch that His enemies denounced Him as a glutton and a wine-bibber; and yet, in all things, He made it His meat and His drink to do His Father's will. He was content and cheerful even when He had not where to lay His head. He could refuse all the kingdoms of the world that He might worship God and serve Him alone. He could rejoice even in His unparalleled sorrows for the joy set before Him, the joy of being perfect as His Father in heaven was perfect. Let the mind that was in Christ be in us also; let us cultivate His preference of duty to pleasure, of service to gain, of doing good to getting good; and instead of withering away in our ways, we shall find every path in which we walk a path of life, a path that leads us home.

Grass withers;

Flowers fade:

But the word of the Lord endureth for ever.

S. Cox.

THE ARAMAIC GOSPEL.

INDICATIONS OF TRANSLATION (*continued*).

ALL who have had experience in conducting examinations in foreign languages are fully aware that when a word has several meanings, more or less closely connected, the different translators are well nigh certain to exhaust all the possible meanings in their endeavours to reproduce the foreign word in their own language. In our February paper we selected several cases in which the same tendency was observable in the two translations of the Hebrew Scriptures presented to us respectively in the Septuagint and the New Testament quotations. One other instance may be quoted here, as a fitting introduction to our present paper. It is the memorable passage in Isaiah liii. 4, "Surely He hath borne (נָשָׂא) our griefs, and carried our sorrows." Now the word נָשָׂא is one of the most equivocal of all Hebrew words; it possesses remarkable variety of shades of meaning, and the translators of our Authorized Version, who often seem bent on displaying the vast resources of the English language, and prompted by a desire to deal fairly with competing synonyms, translate this one Hebrew verb by no less than forty-one distinct English words, of which the favourites, according to Dr. Young's *Analytical Concordance*, are "to bear," which occurs 156 times; "lift up," 137 times; "take up," 116; "carry," 25. Knowing this tendency, we are quite prepared to find the passage in Isaiah variously translated in our Greek versions.

- LXX. of Isa. liii. 4: οὗτος τὰς ἀμαρτίας ἡμῶν φέρει.
He carries (or bears) our sins.
- I Pet. ii. 24: ὃς τὰς ἀμαρτίας ἡμῶν αὐτὸς ἀνήνεγκεν.
Who His own self bare our sins.
- Matt. viii. 17: αὐτὸς τὰς ἀσθενείας ἡμῶν ἔλαβεν.
He Himself took our infirmities.

Now if, as most scholars are agreed, our Lord spoke Aramaic, and if the earliest memoir of our Lord's words and deeds was written in this language, and the first three evangelists had access to this document, and sometimes translated from it, we should expect the same phenomenon to show itself in the Gospels; *viz.* that Aramaic words which have a variety of allied meanings would be rendered by the translators by different Greek words. And if it can be shown in numerous instances, that, *in parallel passages of the synoptists, the divergent Greek words yield, when translated, the several recognised meanings of one Aramaic word*, we venture to regard this as evidence that the passages in question are translations from an Aramaic original.

1. Our first illustration shall be taken from those passages in which the Lord Jesus, with a distinct foreknowledge of the mode of His own death, uses the metaphor of crucifixion in enjoining the duty of self-denial, which was henceforth to be the chief characteristic of those who would be members of the Messianic kingdom.

MATT. X. 38.

καὶ ὃς οὐ λαμβάνει
τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ
καὶ ἀκολουθεῖ ὀπίσω μου,
οὐκ ἔστι μου ἄξιος.

LUKE XIV. 27.

ὅστις οὐ βαστάζει
τὸν σταυρὸν ἑαυτοῦ,
καὶ ἔρχεται ὀπίσω μου,
οὐ δύναται εἶναι μου μαθητής.

On another occasion our Lord gave the same injunction in slightly variant language, and His words are reproduced with rare verbal agreement in each of the synoptic Gospels. Matthew xvi. 24; Mark viii. 34; Luke ix. 23: "If any one wishes to come after Me, let him deny himself, and *take up* (ἀράτω) his cross daily, and follow Me." Does not the combination of words, *taking* the cross (λαμβάνω), *taking up* the cross (αἶρω), and *carrying* the cross (βαστάζω), remind us of the variant renderings of the Hebrew word נָשָׂא? And does not this suggest to us that there may be some one

Aramaic word which possesses all those meanings, so that the three Greek words are variant renderings of this one word in the original? Our conjecture is correct; and the desiderated word is לָטַל . It would be interesting, and not a little confirmatory, if we could show that in passages where לָטַל occurs in the Targums, our three Greek words occur in the Septuagint. We can do this readily with reference to $\lambda\alpha\mu\beta\acute{\alpha}\nu\omega$ and $\alpha\acute{\iota}\rho\omega$, but $\beta\alpha\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\zeta\omega$ only occurs once in the Septuagint; yet if the *word* is thus rare, we hope to show clearly that its *meaning* belongs to לָטַל . The following are instances where לָטַל occurs in the Targums arranged according to the meanings of our Greek words:

- Gen. xxvii. 3: Take ($\lambda\acute{\alpha}\beta\epsilon$) thy weapons, thy quiver and thy bow.
 Jud. xvi. 31: Samson's brethren came down and took him ($\epsilon\lambda\alpha\beta\omicron\nu$), and buried him between Zorah and Eshtaol.
 Josh. iii. 6: Take up ($\acute{\alpha}\rho\alpha\tau\epsilon$) the ark, and pass over.
 2 Sam. ii. 32: They took up ($\alpha\acute{\iota}\rho\omicron\nu\sigma\iota$) Asahel, and buried him.
 1 Sam. xiv. 7: Jonathan's armour-bearer (\acute{o} $\alpha\acute{\iota}\rho\omicron\nu$ $\tau\acute{\alpha}$ $\sigma\kappa\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\eta$).
 Exod. xxv. 14: Thou shalt put the staves into the rings on the sides of the ark, to lift, or carry ($\alpha\acute{\iota}\rho\epsilon\upsilon$), the ark with them.

As instances of לָטַל with the *meaning* of $\beta\alpha\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\zeta\omega$, *i.e.* to carry a heavy burden, we may quote

- Josh. iv. 8: The children of Israel took twelve stones out of the midst of Jordan. And
 Deut. iv. 7, Where we read in the Targum of Jonathan: "What people is so great, to whom the Lord is so nigh in the name of the word of the Lord? For the custom of the nations is to *carry* their gods upon their shoulders, that they may seem to be nigh unto them; but the word of the Lord sitteth upon His throne, . . . and heareth our prayers when we pray before Him."

These passages show conclusively that the Aramaic word לָטַל covers the three Greek words; and if we assume that לָטַל was the verb which our Lord employed, and that these are variant renderings of the one word, we can thus explain

more satisfactorily than in any other way the diversity in our Greek Gospels.

2. We will continue our researches, in the same group of utterances as to self-denial to which we have referred, each of which occurs, as we have seen, five times in the whole: once in each of the synoptists with verbal agreement, and once in Matthew and Luke respectively, with substantial, but not verbal agreement.

LUKE ix. 24.	LUKE xvii. 33.
(Matt. xvi. 25; Mark viii. 35.)	
ὅς γὰρ ἐὰν θέλῃ	ὅς ἐὰν ζητήσῃ
τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ	τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ
σῶσαι,	περιποιήσασθαι,
ἀπολέσει αὐτήν·	ἀπολέσει αὐτήν·
ὅς δ' ἂν ἀπολέσῃ	καὶ ὅς ἐὰν ἀπολέσῃ
τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ	[αὐτήν],
ἔτεκεν ἑμοῦ,	
οὗτος σώσει αὐτήν.	ζωογονήσει αὐτήν.

When we endeavour to translate into Aramaic the first of these passages, which occurs, with some very slight verbal differences which we cannot well exhibit, in each of the three Gospels, if we use the most common words, we find that they yield a striking alliteration, which is of itself an encouraging indication that we are correct. The most common word for “destroy” is ܫܝܥܝܐ, and for “save” ܫܝܘܝܒ; so that in Aramaic the aphorism would run thus:

. . . ܡܢ ܕܝܫܝܘܝܒ ܢܦܫܐ ܝܫܥܝܐ or ܡܢ ܕܒܥܝ ܠܫܝܘܒܐ
 ܘܡܢ ܕܝܫܝܥܝܐ ܢܦܫܐ ܝܫܘܒܢܐ

And this we regard as the original of the entire group.

Let us examine the words separately. ܫܝܥܝܐ is said to be the Shaphel form of ܫܥܝܐ, to go out: and hence means, to bring out, to bring to an end, complete; but also, to make an end of, to ruin, destroy. We had occasion to remark in our first paper, that Aramaic was far from being

so prolific as Hebrew in words indicating destruction. There are *forty* Hebrew words which are in our English Bible translated "destroy." It would be difficult to find one-fourth that number in Aramaic. But while this may seem creditable to the Aramæans, it has a disadvantage to the modern philologist, in that it blunts the edge of the meaning of the Aramaic words. Our word ܐܝܨܝܫ , for instance, is used for the translation of so many Hebrew words, that we can only have a blurred conception attaching to it, whereas one would have desired a meaning clear and definite, especially when it comes from the lips of the Lord Jesus as to the hereafter. Such precision is, we fear, unattainable in the case before us.

To represent the great antithesis, we have in our Greek Gospels three words, $\sigma\hat{\omega}\sigma\alpha\iota$, περιποιήσασθαι , and ζωογονήσει .

$\sigma\hat{\omega}\zeta\epsilon\iota\upsilon$ = (1) to rescue or deliver from danger or destruction; (2) to heal. It is thus admirably fitted to express the salvation of the Gospel, which is both rescue from the penalty of sin and also restoration to health, a continual sanctification.

περιποιεῖσθαι = to keep safe, preserve; reserve for oneself, gain possession of. In the LXX. it is twice used as the antithesis of ἀποκτείνειαι . Genesis xii. 12, Abraham says to Sarah, "They will kill me, but save thee alive"; and in Exodus i. 16 Pharaoh gives the command, "If it be a son, kill it; if it be a daughter, preserve it alive" (περιποιεῖσθε αὐτό).

ζωογονεῖν = to endow with life, to give life, preserve alive. In actual usage there cannot have been much difference between this word and the foregoing, since in Exodus i. 17, where the disobedience of the midwives is narrated, we read, $\text{ἐζωογόνουν τὰ ἄρσενά}$, "they preserved the males alive." So vers. 18, 22.

Thus we see that the words are almost synonymous. $\text{Σ\hat{\omega}\zeta\epsilon\iota\upsilon}$ fixes the thoughts usually upon the danger avoided:

ζωογονεῖν on the escape safe and sound, the preservation of life; περιποιεῖσθαι on the advantage resulting from the deliverance, the gain as compared with the loss of life; but this distinction is not always conspicuous: and the ideas implied in the whole three are all covered by the word **בְּיַיִב**, which means to rescue from danger or death. The following instances of the usage of **בְּיַיִב** in the Targums will substantiate this:

- Gen. xix. 20: Lot, in begging to be allowed to go no farther than Zoar, says: "Let me save myself (or, be saved) there."
- Gen. xxxii. 30: I have seen God face to face, and my life is preserved. (LXX., ἐσώθη μου ἡ ψυχή.)
- 2 Kings xx. 6. Isaiah promises to Hezekiah from the Lord: "I will save (LXX. σώσω) thee and this city from the hand of the king of Assyria."
- Amos ii. 14: And the place of refuge shall perish from the swift, and the mighty man shall not save his own soul (or, life). (**אֵלֵי בְּיַיִב נִפְשָׁם**; LXX., οὐ μὴ σώσῃ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ.)
- Dan. iii. 28: Nebuchadnezzar says, "Blessed be God, who hath sent His angel, and *delivered* His servants." There the word is used of the three youths who were "preserved alive" in the midst of the burning fiery furnace.

The reason for the change of verb in the Greek Gospels is evident from the context. In the triple occurrence it is used in the broadest sense of the great doctrine of self-denial. The antithesis of the here and the hereafter, earth and heaven, self and God, is set before the disciple, and the broad principle stated, he only worthily lives the higher life who is ready at any moment to sacrifice the lower life. In the second quotation from Luke (chap. xvii. 33) we are planted in the midst of the dire calamities which shall precede the second coming of the Son of Man; and in view of the temptation to sacrifice principle in presence of the fiery furnace of persecution, the evangelist was led to make

a particular application of the great fundamental principle, as he says: "He that seeks to preserve his life shall destroy it, and he who is ready to destroy it shall preserve it."

3. Our next illustration shall be from the Lord's Prayer. It is very significant that our Greek Gospels should present *any* verbal divergences in this passage, which must so early have become engrained in the Church's life. These divergences would never have existed if Christ originally uttered the prayer in Greek, for oral tradition might surely be trusted to transmit this brief portion *verbatim*; and more than that, if the Aramaic Gospel had not obtained a wide circulation before our Greek Gospels were penned, there would surely have been one common stereotyped translation to which the evangelists would have adhered. The point to which we wish to direct attention was briefly alluded to in our February paper, but it is desirable that the evidence in support of our explanation should be produced.

Matt. vi. 12: Forgive us our *debts*, as we also have forgiven our debtors.

Luke xi. 4: Forgive us our *sins*; for we also forgive every one who is indebted to us.

We would first speak of the contrasted words "debts" and "sins" or "trespasses," *ὀφειλήματα* and *ἁμαρτίας*. As we have said, we consider these to be variant translations of the one word *חוב*, which means, according to Levy, (1) Schuld, debitum; (2) Sünde; (3) Strafe. (1) a debt; (2) a debt to God, a sin; (3) punishment. As instances of these meanings we may quote:

(1) Deut. xix. 15: (Jonathan) The testimony of one witness shall not be valid against a man for any assault, nor for any money-debt (*חוב קיטון*); the sentence shall be confirmed upon the mouth of two witnesses, or three.

- 2 Kings iv. 7: Elisha says to the widow whose oil he has multiplied: "Go, sell thy oil, and pay thy creditor (מְיָרֵי הוֹבָה), the lord of thy debt), and thou and thy sons shall be supported on the rest."
- (2) Gen. xxxi. 36: Jacob says to Laban: "What is my trespass?" (חֻבָּה)
- Gen. i. 17: Joseph's brethren say: "Oh! forgive now the trespass of thy brethren."
- 1 Sam. xxv. 28: Forgive the trespass of thy handmaid.
- (3) Gen. iv. 13: My punishment is greater than I can bear.
- Lev. v. 1: The phrase, "He shall bear his iniquity," becomes here and elsewhere in the Targum, "He shall receive his punishment" (יִקְבַּל חוֹבָה).
- Job xxiv. 12: From the city the sons of men do groan, and the souls of them that are wounded with the sword do pray; and shall not God inflict punishment? (לֹא יִשְׁנֵי חוֹבָה)

It will be noticed also that in the first Gospel we read, "AS we forgive," while the third Gospel says, "FOR we forgive." On our hypothesis of an Aramaic document, this is accounted for very simply. The word for "as," "sicut," is כְּכִי. The equivalent of "for" in this connexion is בְּכִי, "in eo," "quatenus," "seeing that." The difference in Aramaic is therefore merely that of two letters very much alike and easily confounded.

4. If it be conceded that *ὀφείλημα* and *ἁμαρτία* are translations of the one Aramaic word חוֹב, is it not equally apparent that the very ancient various reading of Mark iii. 29 is due to the same cause? The Authorized Version says: "He that shall blaspheme against the Holy Ghost hath never forgiveness, but is in danger of eternal damnation" (*αἰωνίου κρίσεως*); whereas the Revisers, on the authority of B, L, Δ, S, read *αἰωνίου ἁμαρτήματος*, "is guilty of an eternal sin." We are strongly of opinion that the two readings are variant translations of the words of the primitive document:

יהו כתיחב חובא דעלמא

When once the Church of Christ fully realizes the truth, which has hitherto lain in a state of sub-consciousness, that our Lord spoke Aramaic, there cannot fail to be a strong desire to get back to the *ipsissima verba* which proceeded from His lips, especially in His utterances as to the hereafter. This will however always be precarious where we have only one record of His words; but where we have two or three divergent renderings, or ancient various readings, the very divergences help us to perceive what the original Aramaic was. In the case before us we have κρίσις—used, as often in the New Testament, in the sense of “condemnation, punishment”—and ἁμαρτημα, “sin,” both very ancient readings, going back, we believe, to the times when the primitive document was first translated; and from this we are enabled to discern that both are almost certainly various renderings of the one word חֹב. If this is so, we are wonderfully helped in the interpretation of the passage. He that persists in sin wrongs his own soul; and when sin is unforgiven, the sinner bears his iniquity. The two Hebrew words for “forgiveness” are סלח, to lift, and נשא, to lift up, bear, remove. When sin therefore is forgiven, God lifts it, God bears it; but an eternal sin is one which man must for ever bear. Moreover the fact that “guilt” and “punishment” were in the Saviour’s mind not two thoughts, but one, expressed by one word, חֹב, teaches us the great truth that sin unlifted is its own punishment, guilt its own hell.

5. Our next illustration shall be on a kindred theme. We read in

Matt. x. 28: Fear Him who is able to *destroy* both soul and body in Gehenna.

Luke xii. 5: Fear Him who after He hath killed is able to *cast* into Gehenna.

The two variants which we wish to identify with one and the same Aramaic form are ἀπολέσαι, to destroy, and

ἐμβαλεῖν, to cast. This common form is שָׁנַר. The lexicons give two distinct words, שָׁנַר. The first means to throw, cast; "hinwerfen," "abjicere, projicere." As to the appropriateness of this verb to the context in our Gospels, we leave the reader to judge. It occurs

Deut. xxviii. 26: Thy corpse shall be *thrown* for food to all the birds of heaven.

Jer. xxxvi. 30: Thus saith the Lord concerning Jehoiakim, His corpse shall be *thrown* to the heat by day, and to the frost by night.

Jer. xxii. 19: As men *cast* forth the corpse of an ass, so shall they *cast* forth his corpse. It shall be dragged and unbound outside the gate of Jerusalem.

The other usages of the verb are, so far as I have observed, all linked with the same unpleasant associations.

But there is a second verb, שָׁנַר or שִׁנַּר, which means 'accendere, succendere, comburere, calefacere,' to set on fire, burn, consume, heat. I have only found one instance of it in the Targums.

Ezek. xxxix. 9: They shall *set on fire* . . . their weapons, their shields and their bucklers, their bows and their arrows; . . . and they shall kindle with them a fire lasting seven years.

The word is certainly Aramaic, but was appropriated by rabbinic writers, and is regularly employed of heating a furnace. Buxtorf gives a strange passage from the Talmud: "The Gentile heats the oven, and the Jew bakes the bread." So also "a heated furnace" is תְּנֹרָא שְׁנִירָא. When we have these facts before us, and especially when we bear in mind the words of our Saviour recorded in Luke xvi. 24, and doubtless intended by Him symbolically, "I am in anguish in this flame," we can see no reason to doubt that the word used by our Lord was שָׁנַר, and that this was variously rendered ἀπολέσαι and ἐμβαλεῖν.

6. We have said that the word שָׁנַר is thought by Levy and Buxtorf to represent two distinct roots, now spelt alike,

but once dissimilar. He who works with these two lexicons will soon discover that Levy evinces more of the spirit of the modern philologist in showing that the apparently divergent meanings are in many cases derivable from the same fundamental conception, and not separate roots. There is, for instance, the verb שׂרָא, which means according to Buxtorf, (1) to begin; (2) to dwell, rest, encamp; (3) to loosen, dissolve, forgive, acquiesce—meanings tolerably wide apart certainly. But Levy ingeniously suggests that the root-thought is *to loosen*. From this, as branches from the trunk, he finds the meanings (1) to set free; (2) absolve, forgive; (3) to unyoke the beasts of burden, to loosen one's girdle, to rest, sit down, encamp; (4) to loosen oneself from previous conditions, to start afresh, begin. But even if it can thus be shown that the meanings of "*beginning*" and "*sitting to rest*" are cognate, they are at all events distant relatives; and if we can show in two instances that those divergent meanings stand precisely parallel to each other in the harmony, this will, we think, make a strong case.

MARK ii. 6.

ἦσαν δὲ καθήμενοι
τινες τῶν γραμματέων
καὶ διαλογιζόμενοι.

LUKE v. 21.

καὶ ἤρξαντο
οἱ γραμματεῖς
καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι
διαλογίζεσθαι.

The homologous phrases clearly are ἦσαν καθήμενοι and ἤρξαντο, or, as it might be expressed, ἦσαν ἀρχόμενοι. "The Scribes were sitting and reasoning," "The Scribes . . . were beginning to reason." Thus both are possible translations of

וְהוּוּ שְׂרִין סְפָרְיָא וְחֻשְׁבִּין

The context suggests the mid-day rest; retreating to the shelter of the house from the scorching heat of the valley of Gennesareth—a temporary encampment; and this thought is expressed equally well by both שׂרָא and κάθημαι.

7. In Luke iii. 23 we have a singular phrase, *καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν Ἰησοῦς ἀρχόμενος ὡσεὶ ἐτῶν τριάκοντα*: "Jesus was about thirty years of age, beginning," or, "when He began." To this our Revisers virtually add the word *διδάσκειν*, as they render, "when He began *to teach*." I have no doubt that these eminent scholars are correct in this, but it is questionable whether any of them were aware that they were thus following, if our hypothesis be substantiated, the example of the evangelist Mark.

ΜΑΤΤ. xiii. 1.
ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ
ἐκάθητο

παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν.

ΜΑΡΚ iv. 1.
καὶ πάλιν
ἤρξατο
διδάσκειν

παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν.

I would suggest that the passage in the *Logia* ran thus:

וְתַנְיִנּוּת שָׂרָא עַל יַמָּא

which may mean, "Again He sat by the sea," or, "Again He began by the sea," to which the second evangelist added *διδάσκειν*, as the Revisers do in Luke iii. 23.

8. Another of these equivocal verbs of very frequent occurrence is קַבַּל, which means (1) to receive, receive with approval, take pleasure in; (2) to hear, understand, obey; (3) to shout, cry. It is by an appeal to these variant meanings that we can explain two instances of divergence in parallel passages in our synoptic Gospels.

Matt. x. 40: He that *receiveth* you receiveth Me.

Luke x. 16: He that *heareth* you heareth Me.

The word קַבַּל is of very frequent occurrence in both these meanings. The only difference is, that when it means "to receive," it governs the accusative; and when it means "to hear," it is followed by the preposition מִן: so that the two sentences would respectively in Aramaic run thus:

מִן דִּיקַבְּלֵנְכוֹן יְקַבְּלֵנִי
מִן דִּיקַבְּלֵ מְנַכְּוֹן יְקַבְּלֵ מְנִי

9. In the interpretation of the parable of the sower, in the description of those who represent the good soil, we have three expressions used to commend their treatment of the word sown.

MATT. xiii. 23.	MARK IV. 20.	LUKE viii. 15.
συνιών,	παραδέχονται,	κατέχουσι,
understand.	receive, or accept.	retain.

We cannot but regard these three words as variant renderings of the Aramaic ܠܒܝܢ. The root-thought of this verb is "to take in." Hence (1) to accept, (2) to take-in the meaning, to understand; (3) to take-in permanently, to take home, retain. The following usages of ܠܒܝܢ in the Targums will illustrate this:

- (1) Ps. xxiv. 5: He shall receive the blessing from the Lord.
 Isa. xii. 3: Ye shall receive new teaching with joy from the elect of the righteous.
- (2) Gen. xxiii. 15, 16: And Ephron said, The land is worth four hundred shekels of silver: between me and thee what is that? And Abraham *understood* Ephron, and weighed him the silver.
- (3) Lev. v. 1: "He shall receive his punishment." This phrase, which is the regular Targumic equivalent of our English phrase, "He shall bear his iniquity," certainly means more than a temporary punishment; it implies "retention," a permanent bearing of the guilt.

10. Our next illustrations shall be from the sermon on the mount.

MATT. v. 42.	LUKE vi. 30.
τῷ αἰτοῦντί σε	παντὶ αἰτοῦντί σε
δίδου,	δίδου.
καὶ τὸν θέλοντα	καὶ
ἀπὸ σοῦ δανείσασθαι	ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵροντος τὰ σὰ
μὴ ἀποστραφῆς.	μὴ ἀπαίτει.

The two somewhat divergent pairs of words to which we

would direct attention occur in the last two lines—the addition of *θέλοντα* being quite an insignificant detail. Does any one Aramaic word cover the two meanings of *δανείζομαι*, to borrow, and *αἶρω*, to take away more or less forcibly? This is certainly the case with *ܢܦܝܢ*, which generally means “to borrow,” but has as its root-idea, not the “bated breath and whispered humbleness” of the modern borrower, but the forceful seizure of goods and money in the name of a loan to a tyrannical ruler; “exactorem agere,” as did the *ἀγγαροι* of the Oriental monarchs, who had authority to press into their service horses, vessels, and even the men they met. This second meaning is of more frequent occurrence in rabbinic literature than in the Targums, but it is certainly the root-idea.

In the last line we have *μη ἀποστραφής*, “turn thou not away,” and *μη ἀπαίτει*, “ask (them) not again.” This we think is precisely the difference between the Peal and Aphel of the verb *הרה*. The Peal = to turn back, turn round, turn away. The Aphel, to bring back, fetch back, ask back, to answer. In an unvocalized text it would be impossible to distinguish these meanings. *לא תהרה* might with equal propriety be rendered, “turn not away,” or “ask not back.”

11. Besides the verb *הרה*, of which we have just been speaking, there is a distinct Paelic verb *הרהר*, to honour, ascribe honour, glorify; and it is through these similar forms that we would explain the following :

MATTHEW xi. 25.	LUKE x. 21.
ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ καιρῷ	ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ
ἀποκριθεὶς	ἠγαλλιάσατο
ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν.	τῷ Πνεύματι τῷ Ἁγίῳ, καὶ εἶπεν.

The verb *הרה* in the Aphel and Pael regularly means “to answer” in rabbinic literature, and thus = *ἀποκριθείς* in the

first Gospel. And as for *ἡγαλλιάσατο*, this verb means to glory, rejoice, exult in a person or thing, to glorify; as Luke i. 47, "My soul doth magnify the Lord, and my spirit hath glorified God my Saviour." But this is also the meaning of the second root, ܓܠܓܘܢ, as is clear from Daniel iv. 31 (34), "I have praised and *glorified* Him that liveth for ever," and ver. 34 (37), "And I praise, extol, and *glorify* the King of heaven." We conclude then that both *ἀπεκρίθη* and *ἡγαλλιάσατο* are possible renderings of the Pael ܓܠܓܘܢ.

12. Our last set of illustrations shall be taken from the triple discourse as to the awfulness of offending one of Christ's little ones.

ΜΑΤΤ. xviii. 6.	MARK ix. 42.	LUKE x'vii. 2.
συμφέρει αὐτῷ,	καλόν ἐστι αὐτῷ μᾶλλον	λυσιτελεῖ αὐτῷ
ἵνα κρεμασθῆ	εἰ περὶκείται	εἰ περὶκείται
μύλος ὀνικῶς	λίθος μυλικῶς	λίθος μυλικῶς
περὶ τὸν τράχηλον	περὶ τὸν τράχηλον	περὶ τὸν τράχηλον
αὐτοῦ,	αὐτοῦ,	αὐτοῦ,
καὶ καταποντισθῆ	καὶ βέβληται	καὶ ἔρριπται
ἐν τῷ πελάγει τῆς θαλάσσης.	εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν.	εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν.
ὅς δ' ἂν σκανδαλίσῃ	ὅς δ' ἂν σκανδαλίσῃ	ἢ ἵνα σκανδαλίσῃ
ἕνα τῶν μικρῶν τούτων	ἕνα τῶν μικρῶν τούτων	τῶν μικρῶν τούτων ἕνα.
τῶν πιστευόντων εἰς ἐμέ.	τῶν πιστευόντων εἰς ἐμέ.	

It would be difficult to find a passage which presents clearer indications of translation than the above. We have certainly here agreement in substance, but not in words. Let us look at the first line. We have there *συμφέρει*, it is advantageous, profitable; *καλόν ἐστι*, it is good, well, pleasant, agreeable; and *λυσιτελεῖ*, strictly, it pays the taxes, returns expenses, hence, is remunerative, advantageous. Can we find one Aramaic word which possesses all these meanings? Yes, it is the word ܘܨܘܘܢܐ. Buxtorf says it means (1) prodesse; (2) voluptatem percipere; (3) lucrari, quæstum facere. Precisely the meanings we want; and, by the way, in the very order of our three evangelists. The

following illustrations from the Targums will make this clear :

- (1) Prov. xi. 4 : Riches do not profit in the day of wrath.
 Job xxxv. 3 : What advantage is there to me more than my sin?
- (2) Jer. xxxi. 26 : My sleep was pleasant to me.
 Ezek. xvi. 31 : As a harlot who derives pleasure from her hire.
- (3) Gen. xxxvii. 26 : What money shall we gain if we slay our brother?
 Esther iv. 1 : And Mordecai knew by means of Elijah the high priest all that was done in heaven above, . . . and how it was written and sealed to destroy Israel from upon the earth, and how it was written and sealed in heaven that they should *derive gain* from the banquet of the wicked Ahasuerus, for the seal was sealed with clay.

13. The next line presents us Mark and Luke in unison with *περίκειται*, while Matthew gives *κρεμασθή*. Our Revisers refuse to admit any difference between the two words and in each case render, "were hanged about his neck." Perhaps they are right in this; though strictly *περίκειμαι* refers more to the process of laying or fastening the rope around the neck, while *κρεμάννυμι* means to hang or suspend, directing our thoughts to the object to which the rope is attached. The common Aramaic word was probably *תָּלָה*, which means to hang, hang up, suspend. The cognate *הָלָה* occurs in the Hebrew Bible, and when it denotes crucifixion or impalement, it is rendered in the Targums by *בָּלָה*; but when the simple idea of suspension is implied the Targums use *תָּלָה*, as in 2 Samuel xviii. 10, of Absalom suspended in the oak; and in Psalm cxxxvii. 2, of the captive Jews who hanged their harps on the willows. In both these instances the verb *κρεμάννυμι* is used in the Septuagint; and as an indication that the Aramaic *תָּלָה* also included the meaning of *περίκειμαι* we may cite Jonah ii. 6, where *תָּלָה* is used as the translation of the Hebrew word *שָׁבַח*, to bind or fasten.

14. In the sixth line we have three words to represent the

process of throwing into the sea. Matthew has *καταποντισθῆναι*, which the Authorized Version renders "were drowned in the depth of the sea," but the Revisers properly change to "were sunk." Mark has *βέβληται*, "cast into the sea," and Luke, *ῥριπται*, "thrown into the sea."

The one word which admirably represents all these Greek verbs is the Passive of *ܢܬܦܫ*. The force of *καταποντίζω*, to precipitate, cause to sink down, is clearly involved in this verb; as we see, for instance, in Exodus xv. 1, "The horse and his rider hath He sunk into the sea"; and in Job xxxviii. 6, where, in reference to the first establishment of solidity in the chaotic abyss, we read: "Upon what are the foundations embedded? and who lowered (or sunk down) the corner stones?" The usual meaning of the verb however is to *throw*; and this of course suits *βάλλω*, the generic word for throwing, and *ρίπτω*, to throw down or throw forth. The verb *ܢܬܦܫ* is constantly used of the throwing of arrows; as in the memorable incident narrated of Elisha in 2 Kings xiii., and in 2 Samuel xi. 24 when Joab sends word to David, "The bowmen shot (*i.e.* threw down arrows) at thy servants from upon the wall." It cannot be denied therefore that the one word *ܢܬܦܫ* covers the meaning of the three Greek words *κατεποντισθῆναι*, *βέβληται*, and *ῥριπται*.

Numerous other instances might be adduced. These are perhaps the more important ones, and I trust will be deemed sufficient to have established our thesis, that the divergences in our synoptic Gospels are in some cases due to a variant translation of one and the same Aramaic word.

J. T. MARSHALL.

OF SPIRITUAL BONDAGE AND FREEDOM.

(JOHN VIII. 31-36.)

As the result of certain very lofty and solemn utterances touching Himself, which had just been forced from our Lord, "many of the Jews" in His audience had conceived a half-persuasion that His claims were after all true. A certain sort of faith had commenced to sprout within their minds. Sick of controversy, Jesus seized this advantage. He addressed them as men half won to be disciples. The result was disappointing. His first words jarred upon their national pride. The discussion was at once re-opened. By degrees, as usual, discussion grew into bitter recrimination, till that ended in open violence.

The whole of this significant controversy we cannot exhaust in a single paper. But the opening of it is of singular interest; for it drew from our Lord some most weighty and memorable words, such as all His disciples have need to remember.

When our Lord, resuming His address, turned Himself to those Jews on whom some impression had been produced, He knew of course that their faith might prove no more than a passing impression or a fitful whim. His object therefore must be to persuade them to persevere. For it is not by fits of well-disposed feeling, or half-convinced belief in Christ, that any one can deserve to be called a disciple of His. The test which alone discriminates genuine faith from such as is impure or spurious is its continuance. Just as the stony ground crop was detected in the parable, so in practice the proof of any man's being a real believer is that he holds on, or continues to receive the word of Christ, and to obey it to the end of life. "He said therefore to those Jews who had believed Him, If ye abide in My word, then are ye truly My

disciples." At first the personal Saviour is to be accepted by our faith as what He claims to be—the Son of God sent from above to save us; with a supreme right therefore to have every word of His believed and every command of His obeyed. It is plain that if you are wholly and utterly sincere in thus accepting Christ, you do virtually at the same time accept all that He has to say to you. Consistency requires you of course to credit the whole teaching and do the whole bidding of One whom you take for a Divine Saviour, the sent Son of the most high God. But perhaps your faith in this Messenger of God is not of that thorough sort which will carry you through, and subdue you to His word. Well then, experience will test it. He calls on you to continue in His word. Keep on listening and obeying. Little by little, let His teaching penetrate your heart and colour your conduct. Learn by experience the effect of living as He bids you. His truth thus reduced to practice will break the bonds of evil habit and base desire and passion and spiritual fear, and every other dark power which has hitherto tyrannised over you. More and more as you come to know the truth, "the truth will make you free"!

This is Jesus' word to all young converts, or those who think themselves such. Do not suppose everything is gained. Do not too easily trust your own incipient faith. Try yourselves, whether you can work out Christ's will in daily life without growing tired of it, without finding the difficulty of it too much for you. At first it must be hard. There is a bondage to be broken you have little conception of: the bondage of an evil will, stiffened now into evil habits, very hard to exchange for good ones. But do not be discouraged: the truth is the liberator. Abide in the truth as it is in Jesus; let it work fully; it will make you free.

The mistake which some ill-advised young disciples com-

mit is to be too soon satisfied with a certain sort of freedom. When the gospel of pardon comes to any one's heart with power, it sets him free at once from the bondage of a fearful conscience, from the burden of remembered guilt, and from the unspeakable terrors of the wrath of God. That is a liberation so wonderful and unexpected, that the new convert, in the first sense of relief, leaps and springs for joy, ignorant or excusably forgetful that there are any fetters left still unbroken. But there are. And usually it is not long before they begin to gall. The bondage to the law indeed, as an accuser, and as a condition of God's favour, is broken. But bondage to sin is not yet broken, or only in part. The old customs of desiring, choosing, and taking pleasure in what is at variance with God's holy will, are all of them so many chains wound round about the heart and will of a sinful man. These are not to be snapped in an instant. They have to be unwound by degrees and with infinite pains, that the will and the affections, when disengaged from the former bondage to sin, may be made glad and willing servants of God unto righteousness. There is no royal road to such eventual liberation of the soul. It can be done only in one way; that is to say, by a patient, watchful, persistent, and lifelong continuance in the word of Christ: so "shall ye know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."

These Jews did not catch His meaning. It was, in fact, one of the Master's deep words, which the world has been trying ever since to fathom, with very imperfect success. We are still a great way from understanding all the connexions betwixt God's truth and man's freedom; or in how many ways, religious, intellectual, social, and political, real liberty is conditioned by obedience to spiritual truth, and can only follow in the train of that. Still, it was a sign that conscience still slumbered in these men, that the idea of a personal emancipation from the yoke of their own sins

never so much as occurred to them. Their thoughts went at once to their political emancipation from the foreigner.

How they could venture to say of the Hebrew people, "We have never yet been in bondage to any man," I do not very well know. Not to speak of the seventy years their ancestors had spent in Babylon, was not Judæa at that moment administered by a Roman procurator and garrisoned with Roman troops? People however possess a strange faculty for closing their eyes to the meaning of unwelcome facts. The Hebrews are a people who maintained as long as possible, and to an almost preposterous degree, the sentiment of national independence. Fretting beneath many a yoke, they long refused to acknowledge any, or to own, even when compelled to serve, a foreign lord. The more galling Rome's over-lordship was, and the more ready they were to revolt, and the more hopeful of a Messiah to set them free, so much the less were they prepared tamely to accept the title of slaves. Men often will not brook a name when they must needs endure the thing. And, after all, political servitude had not deprived them as individuals of their personal liberty. "Slaves, indeed!" they probably thought: "what though unhappy circumstances have for the moment seated a Roman officer in the seat of our national kings, that does not enslave a freeborn son of Abraham. It is but foregoing certain privileges to meet a temporary emergency; but Hebrews never can, never shall be slaves!"

Into this political question our Lord does not follow them. He brings them back to the spiritual sense of His words. The offensive epithet which in its civil acceptance they had disowned, He fastens down upon them in a religious and moral meaning. They had claimed two things: first, to be Abraham's children; second, to be freemen: two things connected thus, Abraham's seed, and therefore free. In His rejoinder Jesus proceeds to

strip them of both titles, in the spiritual sense of them. But He takes the two in reverse order, and reasons thus: First, not free in God's house; and therefore (second) not true sons of Abraham. The proof which He alleges on both these points leads Him to some very interesting positions. But it is only of the former I can speak in this paper. What we have to consider for the present is His proof in vers. 34, 35, and 36, that the Judæans of His time were not, in the spiritual and only deep sense of the word, *God's freemen*.

The proof rests upon another of our Lord's axiomatic utterances: "Every one that committeth sin is the bond-servant—rather, is a slave—of sin." These words go to the root of the fall of man. To understand them, let us revert for an instant to Adam's experience in the hour of his lapse from obedience. God had made Adam free. That freedom consisted in his perfectly voluntary acceptance of the Divine will as the regulator of his conduct. His own nature, being modelled on the Divine, acted best—most freely, that is—when it moved in cheerful and easy harmony with the mind of God. In other words, as all creatures, when allowed to act with perfect freedom, follow the law of their nature, so did man follow the moral will of God. For him to obey God was nothing else but the natural outcome of those godlike dispositions and aptitudes for virtue which were native to him. He had been made for innocence and for virtue: to serve the Holy One was "perfect freedom." Now, when the man, seduced from his allegiance through foreign influence, accepted the will of another, instead of the will of God, he did violence against his own constitution. He acted at the bidding of a will contrary to the order of his own truest and highest nature. Against his better knowledge, his inborn sense of right, and that instinct of duty which was the divinest thing within him, the man consented to do what the tempter bade him, what

nothing within himself could have prompted save his lower animal desires. In such a fatal and unnatural surrender of his reason, his conscience, and his faith to what was in reality beneath him, there was involved a loss of true liberty. True liberty is not self-will; it is free obedience to natural and legitimate order. But he who exchanges the lawful control of his sovereign for a shameful and unnatural subjection to foreign dictation, is a slave. Hence the bowing down of man's free and righteous will at the feet of the arch-rebel and arch-liar was a surrender of himself into bondage. It meant that henceforth (so far as man was concerned) falsehood might tyrannise over truth, wrong over justice, suspicion over faith, hate over love, the baser over the nobler, the flesh over the spirit, the transient over the everlasting.

Of course we shall seriously misconceive the loss of moral liberty which our Lord says was brought about by that fatal surrender, if we think of it as implying any constraint exercised over a man *against his will*. Nothing compels any of us to sin if we do not choose. Mere physical compulsion has no power to force sin upon the will, or inflict any injury at all upon the soul. Unhappily the bondage spoken of is far deeper, and by so much more wretched and more hopeless. It is the will itself which has come under the power of evil; so that the man, grown enamoured of sin and habituated to it, cannot choose but do it. We are unable to do what is spiritually good, because we are invincibly indisposed to do it. To be sure, this leaves to every man a vast range of choice. Within the realm of ungodliness, or of insubordination to the perfect will of God, there lie innumerable departments of conduct, some better and some worse. A man may live temperately or riotously, honestly or fraudulently, cleanly or vilely; he may make much of his life for useful and honourable ends, or little of it; he may pursue any path of labour or of gain

or of pastime which he fancies; he may listen to the voice of his conscience and the requirements of virtuous society, or despise them: yet in no case will he be able (unless God's grace enable him) to restore himself to the loving service of God as his Father and his King. His life will still lie outside the circle of perfect allegiance, will be still a life enslaved to the sin of ungodliness. "They that are thus in the flesh cannot please God."

In saying this of course one is speaking of what is possible to human nature *as left to itself*. Thank God! it never has been left entirely to itself. Through His mercy, influences never cease to operate upon the hearts of men which come from above. God's gracious Spirit and His truth are everywhere, teaching, drawing, inclining, and enabling men to do better than otherwise they would do. He makes them discontented with their bondage. He moves them to aspire after a life more pleasing to Him. In Christian circles, His regenerating grace is a factor always powerfully at work. But all this is extra-natural; not a pure and simple outcome from the fallen nature itself, but freely given to us through Christ by the Father's favour. What we ought to do is to welcome and yield to these Divine and helpful influences. If we do not, we rivet upon ourselves the chains of evil. It is shocking to think to what length the bondage Christ speaks of may go, through the yielding by the will time after time to evil desire. By easy steps men get habituated to sin. When habit has dulled the conscience or blinded its eyes, forms of vice grow familiar and cease to outrage, which at first would repel the unaccustomed and the young. In this way too the hold of sin upon its victim grows tighter with the passage of the years; for the oftener a person commits sin, the more does he become its bondservant. In some gross instances, every one can see how appetite or passion comes to wield a dominion that is simply terrible. Confirmed

drunkards, for example, will make sincere pledges of abstinence time after time, and be unable to keep them. The lecherous man continues in his old age to be the slave of lewd and impotent desire. Avarice too creeps stealthily upon worldly-minded old age, even till dotage has made the grasping habit appear ludicrous to the onlooker. Cases such as these none can fail to remark. People do not so readily observe how spiritual sins, such as impenitence, or indifference to the gospel, or neglect of prayer, or deference to the opinion of society, or intellectual arrogance, or engrossment in family ambitions and secular care, may obtain a fixed hold upon the soul and carry it captive. Yet these are the things which hold the citadel against Christ in most people of middle age. Against these God's kindly and varied agency for reaching heedless ears and turning obdurate hearts may be plied in vain, or beat against you only to make you so much the harder, as when one hammers cold iron.

In conclusion Christ goes on to preach deliverance to the captives. "The bondservant abideth not in the house for ever: the Son abideth for ever. If therefore the Son shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed."

It is a parable taken from Oriental manners. In an Eastern household we are to conceive of two lads growing up together: the one, eldest born and free, a son by the proper wife; the other slave-born, a handmaid's child. Both are members of the household and share in the householder's care; but their position is very unequal, in respect at all events of its security. The son by virtue of his legitimate and free birth is the natural heir to the home, with a native right to dwell in it for ever. He represents the family succession, and is the lord in reversion of the paternal seat. Not so the slave-born youth: his standing in the home is wholly accidental and precarious. Liable at any moment to be sent away or manumitted or sold, he

exists as a member of the household on sufferance. Nor can his position be made more secure or permanent by any conduct of his own. Only if it should please the son and heir, administering the household as his father's agent, to release his enslaved half-brother from bondage, and elevate him of his grace to a platform like his own, sharing with him the rights of natural sonship.

Surely this picture is not wholly a fancy sketch. It is far too closely modelled on a great historical type in the early annals of the Old Testament for our Lord not to have had that in His mind. The Jews had just been boasting, "We are Abraham's seed." Now it was precisely in Abraham's house that two such typical youths were found dwelling alongside—the free-born heir and the bondmaid's child. What saith the Scripture? "Cast out the bondwoman and her son: for the son of the bondwoman shall not be heir with the son of the freewoman." A step this which to modern minds, trained in Western habits, appears not a little harsh or even unnatural; nevertheless it illustrates what all Ishmaels were exposed to while slavery and concubinage were recognised institutions, and it serves to lend point to a great spiritual lesson. For what is it our Lord intended by this parable? Plainly no other lesson than St. Paul, acting on this hint, did afterwards work out in his letter to Galatia. God's house is His visible Church or kingdom upon earth. In that family of grace there is but one original and free-born Son, His Father's well-beloved, Heir by birth and right of nature to all the love and goods and honours and gifts of His Divine Father in heaven. Such an Isaac to Jehovah does Jesus claim to be alone. But these Judæans whom He addressed were also in name the children of God through Abraham. Outwardly they occupied a place in the household of the covenant. Meanwhile they abode in God's house, heard His word, and ate of His bread.

What if they were, for all that, in heart and practice, slaves still to sin, as all men are born to be: the sons of a bond-race, in that condition of subjection to the will of the evil one of which our Lord has just been speaking? Is it not clear that if we are that and no more, then we retain our place in the house of God by sufferance only, not by right; tolerated so long as God pleases, but with the fear over us (the fear? nay, the certainty) that we shall be cast out one day?

But by these gracious and wonderfully suggestive words, *if the Son make you free*, has not our Lord opened for us a glimpse into the possibility of our adoption? Granted that He who never committed sin, therefore never became its slave, is alone entitled to abide in His place, and as the sole human Son of God to “dwell in the house of the Lord for ever”: still He may have become a member of God’s earthly house, and linked Himself thus to our fallen family, on very purpose to raise us (if we will) to His own level! Suppose He is come, this only begotten Son of God, to ransom us from our fatal bondage to our sins; suppose that, by uniting us to Himself, He can confer upon us eventual freedom from this inward and spiritual servitude; suppose that He possesses the power of sharing with us His own Divine and eternal life; suppose that He is minded to make such a union with us that we shall be lifted with Himself into family relationship to the Most High, and be made sons and heirs with Christ—what then? If the Son do thus set us free, shall we not be free indeed; ay, and dwell, we too, “in the house of the Lord for ever”?

J. OSWALD DYKES.

A SURVEY OF THE SYNOPTIC QUESTION.

III. POINTS PROVED OR PROBABLE (*continued*).

WE have seen what a large consensus there is of scholars, approaching the study of the Synoptic Gospels from very different directions, in favour of some form of the theory which postulates as the foundation of our present Gospels two main documents, which, although arrived at by critical analysis, and not by external testimony, are yet found to correspond sufficiently well with the two works described by Papias, the "Notes of the Preaching of St. Peter" put together by St. Mark, and the "Collection of *Logia*"—oracles or utterances—of the Lord set down in writing by St. Matthew.

Taking the first of these two documents, we have seen that the statements of Papias as to its origin agree with the facts; that they explain a certain partial, onesided, individual character which it has, distinguishing it from the main body of evangelical tradition, and proving that it is not a direct product of the central and collective action of the Church. We have seen, however, that, although the main outlines of our second Gospel are thus traceable to St. Peter, it still remains an open question whether or not there is another element in the Gospel as well; and it is a question that must also be regarded as open, how far the Gospel as we have it bears marks of editorial revision and additions.

We now come to the second document, and we have to ask ourselves a similar series of questions. As to the detailed structure of this document, how much can we regard as proved, and how much as probable?

We cannot, I fear, go so far in our affirmations about this source as about its companion. There certain main

lines stood out broadly and clearly. That the document was in writing, that it closely resembled our St. Mark, were points about which it seemed that not much remained to be debated. But in regard to this second document, the case is less clear even for its very existence. Yet when we find that in two of our Gospels, the first and third, there is contained a large element of discourse common to both, that one of those Gospels bears the name of the apostle St. Matthew, and that one of the earliest of Church writers is said to have stated expressly that St. Matthew left behind him a collection which may be reasonably interpreted as consisting mainly of discourse, then the conclusion lies near at hand, and has commended itself to the great mass of recent inquirers as probable, that the discourses and sayings which our first and third evangelists join in reporting are derived from the work attributed to St. Matthew.

For this at least is a point on which there is increasing unanimity, that the apostle St. Matthew did not write the whole of the first Gospel as we have it. That he wrote a section of it so important that his name passed from that to the whole, is by most writers willingly conceded; but analysis reveals the composite nature of our Gospel too clearly for it to be probable that we have in it the original work of our apostle as it left his pen. Let us hear Mr. Wright on this subject.

“We have the apparently independent testimony of three witnesses in the second century—Papias, Irenæus, and Pantænus—that St. Matthew wrote in ‘Hebrew.’ Nor is there any ancient authority to the contrary. The Fathers of the Church are agreed that it was so, and only since the Reformation has the fact been seriously, and, as I think, most unjustifiably, called in question.

“Nevertheless the Fathers, as far back as we can trace their opinions, unreservedly accept our first Gospel, which is in Greek, as St. Matthew’s work. While they uphold the Aramaic or ‘Hebrew’ (as they call it) original, they equally uphold the Greek representative as though it

were an exact translation, made either by St. Matthew himself or by some authorized interpreter. And it is in my opinion impossible to ignore this consensus of belief.

“And yet upon close examination nothing appears more certain than that our first Gospel is not immediately a translation. In the first cycle, which it gives almost complete, not only is St. Peter’s narrative adopted, but the most numerous and minute agreements prove that St. Mark’s version has been used. In the second cycle also the same Greek text is followed which we find in St. Luke. And even those parts which are peculiar to the first Gospel do not (like St. Luke’s two preliminary chapters) read like a direct translation from the Aramaic. They are a translation, as indeed the whole Gospel is, but a translation which has been rounded and smoothed by passing through a long line of Greek catechists.

“Our first Gospel therefore is a composite work. St. Peter must be called the author of a considerable part of it. St. Matthew cannot have written down this part—I mean the first cycle—unless we are to suppose that he, an apostle and eyewitness, set aside his own recollections and went to school for his facts with the later Hellenic catechists. Even if he had done this, he would be the editor, rather than the author, of that considerable portion, which indeed forms the historical framework of the whole.”¹

I do not know that Professor Marshall has declared himself on this head, but all the other writers whom I have named as representing recent opinion on the subject would entirely agree with Mr. Wright. This I think we may set down as another point gained, that the first Gospel, like the third, is composite in its origin, secondary, and not primary.

If however it bears the name of St. Matthew, it does so with good reason. It does so because the contents of a work really from the pen of St. Matthew have passed into it. It has incorporated with it that collection of *Logia* which has contributed so prominent and valuable an element to the companion volume by St. Luke.

The problem then before us is to reconstruct from our present Gospels the original collection of *Logia*. Here

¹ *Composition of the Four Gospels*, p. 60 f.; cf. pp. 133-135.

we enter upon a task of great difficulty, and one which, although a quantity of honest and scholarly labour has been expended upon it, is still some way from having reached a definitive conclusion. A number of questions arise. What was the extent of the *Logia*? Were they pure discourse, or was discourse at all intermingled with narrative? In which of the two Gospels, St. Matthew and St. Luke, are the *Logia* preserved more nearly? Does either Gospel represent them accurately? In what relation do the versions which we now possess stand to the original?

1. On the first point some progress has been made. It used to be keenly debated whether the *Logia* admitted any element of narrative; now this is practically not denied. The conversion of Holtzmann was significant. He now allows that the discourses of which the *Logia* were mainly composed may have had brief historical introductions, such as are frequently assigned to them in St. Luke. Such, for instance, would be the introduction to the model prayer, which was given, as St. Luke tells us, in reply to a request from the disciples that they too might be taught a form of prayer as the disciples of the Baptist had been.¹ Such again would be the story about the Galilæans whom Pilate's soldiery slaughtered in the very act of sacrificing;² and the mention of the murmurs of the Pharisaic party which were answered by that succession of beautiful parables—the lost sheep, the lost drachma, the lost son.³ It does not follow at once from this that all these little introductory notices would be accepted as of equal value. Some would seem to belong, not to the document quoted, but to the evangelist, and to be his inferences as to the occasion of parable or saying, drawn from the parable or saying itself. For instance, the parable of the importunate widow seems to

¹ St. Luke xi. 1.

² St. Luke xiii. 1.

³ St. Luke xv. 1, 2.

have had in the first instance quite as much to do with the nearness of the *parousia* as with the duty of perseverance in prayer to which it is referred.¹

2. However this question as to the fragments of connecting narrative which link together the discourses is not of any large dimensions. It is a more important matter to determine where we are mainly to look for the *Logia*, whether in our present St. Matthew or in our present St. Luke. In the choice of these alternatives opinions are greatly divided. This is the state of things. In St. Matthew we have a number of well compacted and neatly arranged blocks of discourse: the sermon on the mount (v.-vii.), the instructions to the twelve (x.), the chapter of parables (xiii.), the invectives against the Pharisees (xxiii.), the eschatological discourses (xxiv., xxv.), besides certain smaller sections interspersed among these. It has been frequently observed that these masses of discourse are in many cases rounded off by the formula, "When Jesus had ended these words," or the like.² On the other hand, the corresponding matter in St. Luke is found in a far more dispersed condition. For instance, St. Luke furnishes parallels to rather more than half the verses of the sermon on the mount (at a rough reckoning 64 verses out of 107); but these parallels are scattered over no less than ten distinct contexts, and even within those contexts with considerable disturbance of order.³

We ask then, which of these two arrangements is nearer to the original? And we cannot be surprised if the balance of probability has been often thought to lie on the side of

¹ St. Luke xviii. 1-8. Cf. Holtzmann, *Einleitung*, p. 352.

² St. Matt. vii. 28, xi. 1, xiii. 53, xix. 1, xxvi. 1. See Weizsäcker, *Apost. Zeitalt.*, p. 387; Holtzmann, *Einleitung*, p. 351, etc.

³ We might assign these contexts roughly thus: (α) St. Luke vi. 20-49; (β) xi. 1-4, 9-13; (γ) xi. 34-36; (δ) xi. 47-49; (ε) xii. 22-36; (ζ) xii. 57-59; (η) xiii. 23-27; (θ) xiv. 34, 35; (ι) xvi. 13; (κ) xvi. 17, 18.

St. Luke. On the one side we have unity, aggregation, compactness, which has very much the appearance of being artificial. On the other side we have dispersion, disorder, confusion, which looks more like the state of nature. "Which is in itself more probable," asks Holtzmann, "that Luke has wantonly destroyed these imposing structures, and scattered the ruins of them to the four winds, or that Matthew has built up his stone-heaps into walls?"¹ Still it is not maintained that the dispersed sayings in St. Luke are all exactly where they should be. Here, for instance, is a graphic image which the writer just quoted adopts from Strauss: "The hard grit of these sayings of Jesus (*die kernigen Reden Jesu*) has not indeed been dissolved by the flood of oral tradition, but they have often been washed away from their original position, and, like rolling pebbles (*Gerölle*), have been deposited in places to which they did not properly belong."² "Erratic blocks," Holtzmann elsewhere calls them. And it must be confessed that this view has at first sight much to recommend it.

It has been a natural form for the theory which goes to St. Luke for the reconstruction of the *Logia* to take, to find a representative section of this primitive document in what is often called "the Great Interpolation or Insertion (*die grosse Einschaltung*)," the long passage which breaks the continuity of the Petrine memoirs as we have them in St. Mark, between Luke ix. 51-xviii. 14. This view is expressed most simply and directly by Wendt, who says that, while St. Matthew has in the main combined together that which is allied in subject, St. Luke has inserted the mass of the *Logia* into the narrative of St. Mark in two great connected portions (Luke vi. 20-viii. 3, and ix. 51-xviii. 14).³ A simple and happy solution of the problem indeed if only

¹ *Einleitung*, p. 352.

² *Ibid.*

³ *Lehre Jesu*, i., p. 46.

it would fit the facts when closely applied to them; but it is the fate of the critic to find first this and then that attractive theory break down under his hand, when it comes to be applied in detail.

This "Great Insertion," or "Journal of Travel" (*Reisebericht*), or "Perean Section," or "Samaritan Section," as it has been variously called, is seen on examination to be also composite in its structure. It contains material which is common to all the Synoptics; it contains material which is common to St. Luke with St. Matthew; but a large proportion of it is peculiar to St. Luke alone. Can we assign the whole of this diverse matter to a single source, the *Logia*? Is it not at the outset strange that the Gospel which has embodied so much of the *Logia* as to have appropriated the name of its author, has nevertheless omitted fully one half of its contents—and that a half which certainly does not yield in interest and attraction to the rest?

But in addition to this, Dr. Ewald, following partly in the steps of Wittichen, adduces an elaborate linguistic argument to show that the peculiar portions in these chapters of St. Luke, while they have all the characteristics of the evangelist's own diction, have also certain special characteristics of their own, presenting, as he thinks, points of contact with the story of the infancy (chaps. i., ii.), and also (*e.g.*) with St. Stephen's speech in the Acts.¹ On the strength of these phenomena, Dr. Ewald postulates a new document, which he calls "R" (*Reisebericht*). I am not sure that the arguments are convincing, but there is nothing improbable in the conclusion: at least, I doubt very much if the whole, or even the greater part, of the long section, Luke ix. 51-xviii. 14, came from the *Logia*.

Another observation Dr. Ewald has made which seems

¹ Pages 237, 238.

to me of decided importance. It is this: that the resemblance between the first and third Gospels in passages which might be supposed to be taken from the *Logia* is very much closer in some places than in others. Dr. Ewald gives lists which will be well deserving of the student's attention on this head. As his book is not likely to be translated or to circulate much in this country, I shall venture to give the reader the benefit of them. They do not profess to be exhaustive, but only to serve as illustrations. For identity of expression he notes the following:

Luke iii. 7-9, 16, 17	=	Matt. iii. 7-12.
Luke vi. 41, 42	=	Matt. vii. 3-5.
Luke vii. 22-28, 31-35	=	Matt. xi. 4-11, 16-19.
Luke ix. 57-60	=	Matt. viii. 18-22.
Luke x. 2	=	Matt. ix. 37, 38.
Luke x. 12-15	=	Matt. xi. 21-24.
Luke x. 21, 22	=	Matt. xi. 25-27.
Luke xi. 24-26	=	Matt. xii. 43-45.
Luke xii. 22-31	=	Matt. vi. 25-33.
Luke xii. 39-46	=	Matt. xxiv. 43-51.
Luke xiii. 34, 35	=	Matt. xxiii. 37-39.
Luke xvi. 13, etc.	=	Matt. vi. 24, etc.

A greater amount of variation is perceptible in

Luke xi. 2-4	=	Matt. vi. 9-13.
Luke xii. 2-9	=	Matt. x. 26b-33.
Luke xiii. 58, 59	=	Matt. v. 25, 26.
Luke xv. 3-7	=	Matt. xviii. 12-14.
Luke xvii. 1-4, etc.	=	Matt. xviii. 8, 7, 51, 21, etc.

Lastly, there are some longer discourses in which resemblance and difference are strongly mixed. So conspicuously the sermon on the mount (Luke vi. 20-49 = Matt. v.-vii., with the exceptions noted in the first list above), the discourse against the Scribes and Pharisees (Luke xi. 39-52 = Matt. xxiii., also with exceptions); and among shorter passages Luke xiv. 25-27 = Matt. x. 37-39.

Dr. Ewald rightly observes, and it is, in fact, very remarkable, how the identity of language in the first set of passages only serves to throw out into stronger relief the little touches of individuality in style and turn of phrase which betray the hand of the evangelist. We can see from such examples how he is in the way of treating his sources. The alterations which he makes are only literary, and do not go deep into the grain.

These phenomena make it strange when we turn to the other set of passages, which, if the same document has still been used, imply a far freer and more masterful handling. The difficulty has been for some time present to my own mind, but Dr. Ewald has certainly advanced the subject a considerable stride by the definiteness which he has imparted to it. Let us endeavour to realize this greater definiteness by setting before ourselves one or two concrete examples. And, first, let us see how closely the evangelist is capable of adhering to the document he is using. The words common to the two Gospels (*i.e.* to the original of both) are printed in roman type; those peculiar to either Gospel in italics. The comparison is based upon the Greek, which underlies the English version.

ST. MATTHEW iii. 7-9.

“Ye offspring of vipers, who warned you to flee from the wrath to come? Bring forth therefore fruit worthy of repentance: and *think* not (*μη δόξητε*) to say within yourselves, We have Abraham to our father: for I say unto you, that God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham. And even now is the axe laid unto the root of the trees: every tree therefore that bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down, and cast into the fire.”

ST. LUKE iii. 7-9.

“Ye offspring of vipers, who warned you to flee from the wrath to come? Bring forth therefore fruits worthy of repentance, and *begin* not (*μη ἀρχησθε*) to say within yourselves, We have Abraham to our father: for I say unto you, that God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham. And even now is the axe *also* laid unto the root of the trees: every tree therefore that bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down, and cast into the fire.”

Here we have two and a half verses which are *verbatim* the same, not only in words, but in the order of the words, with the very slight exceptions of a plural for a singular, an additional conjunction (*καί*), and a single change of phrase, the motive of which is evidently literary.

Now let us set against this the opening of the sermon on the mount, still representing coincidences by roman type and peculiarities by italics. Familiar as the passage is, it will on this very account bring home with greater effect the point we are illustrating.

ST. MATTHEW v. 1-12.

“And *seeing the multitudes*, He went *up into the mountain*: and *when He had sat down*, His disciples came *unto Him*: and *He opened His mouth*, and taught them, saying,

Blessed are *the poor in spirit*
. . .

Blessed are *they that mourn*:
for *they shall be comforted*.

Blessed are the meek: . . .

Blessed are *they that hunger*
and *thirst after righteousness*:
. . .

Blessed are the merciful: . . .

Blessed are the pure in heart:
. . .

Blessed are the peacemakers:
. . .

Blessed are they that have been
persecuted for righteousness' sake:
. . .

Blessed are ye when men shall reproach you, and *persecute you*, and *say all manner of evil against you falsely*, for *My sake*. Rejoice, and *be exceeding glad*: for great is your reward in heaven: for *so persecuted they the prophets which were before you*.”

ST. LUKE vi. 17-26.

“And He came *down with them*, and *stood on a level place*. . . . And He *lifted up His eyes on His disciples*, and said,

Blessed are *ye poor* . . .

Blessed are *ye that hunger now*: . . .

Blessed are *ye that weep now*:
for ye shall *laugh*.

Blessed are ye when men shall *hate you*, and *when they shall separate you* [*from their company*], and *reproach you*, and *cast out your name as evil*, for *the Son of man's sake*. Rejoice *in that day* and *leap for joy*: for, *behold*, your reward is great in heaven: for *in the same manner did their fathers unto the prophets*.

But woe unto you that are rich!
. . .

Woe unto you that are full now! . . . *Woe* [*unto you*] *ye that laugh now!* . . . *Woe* [*unto you*] *when all men shall speak well of you!* for *in the same manner did their fathers to the false prophets*.”

It needs no emphasis to bring out the deep-seated divergence of these extracts—the strange inverting of circumstances in the introduction: the ascent, the descent; the mountain, the plain (or, at least, flat ground); the attitude—sitting, standing; the gesture selected for notice—opening the mouth, lifting the eyes; the audience, in the one case (so far as it appears) stationary, in the other drawing near; and then, in the discourse itself, the aphoristic form of the one version, couched in the third person, the direct address of the other couched in the second; the addition of woes to blessings, with the omission of so many of the latter in St. Luke's version; the different degrees or stages of inwardness from the standpoint of which the two versions appear to be written. When we consider all this, the old historical question, Can we have before us the same discourse? remains indeed, but retires behind the newer critical question, Is it possible that both accounts should be drawn from the same document?

It is obvious to deny this; but, again, we cannot do so with an easy conscience. The two accounts are both introduced at what is really the same point in the history; they both begin in the same manner; they both end in the same manner; and when we pass a little farther down in the discourse (*e.g.* to Matt. vi. 25–33, Luke xii. 22–31), we find ourselves in the presence of a much closer verbal resemblance.

It is difficult then still to shake ourselves free from the *Logia*. But it is doubtless phenomena such as these which have led scholars like Wendt to suppose that, while the *Logia* were used by both evangelists, they had not really the written document actually before them, but quoted from it *memoriter*. That again conflicts with the alternation of exactness with freedom in the method of quoting. And even if we have recourse to the hypothesis of Simons, that the coincidences between our first and third Gospels are

due not only to the use of the same fundamental document, but also to the direct dependence of the one upon the other, still even this does not give a completely satisfactory explanation of the varying degrees of approximation and divergence which prevail in different parts of the two versions.

It is natural that, amongst other hypotheses, recourse should be had to that of a Hebrew or Aramaic original. And it has occurred to me that this might perhaps explain one of the principal difficulties. There appears to be a Hebrew word which has just the required shade of ambiguity between "poor" simply and "poor in spirit,"¹ and which we can easily imagine susceptible of both renderings. It is a word too which comes into one of those central passages of the Old Testament which our Lord took up most directly into His own teaching. It will be observed that, in the Revised Version of Isaiah lxi. 1, the old rendering is retained: "The Spirit of the Lord God is upon me; because the Lord hath anointed me to preach good tidings unto the *meek*"; but "poor" is given as an alternative for "meek" in the margin; and in the quotation of this passage in St. Luke iv. 18, "poor" is the rendering both in the Greek and in the English. In Psalm ix. 18, "The expectation of the poor shall not perish for ever," the Revised Version has "poor" in the text, "meek" in the margin. There can be little doubt that the Hebrew (or Aramaic) corresponding to this was the word originally used in the first beatitude, and that the evangelist has represented it to us by an apt and just paraphrase.

It will be observed that the idea of "comfort to the mourner" occurs in the same context, Isaiah lxi. 2, "To comfort all that mourn," where the idea of mourning also

¹ I am put upon this track by Holtzmann, *Die Synoptiker*, ad loc.

may well be taken in a wider spiritual sense (*οἱ πενθοῦντες οὐ τῆ ψυχῆ μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ τῷ πνεύματι*).

Again, many of the variants in the last beatitude—"hate" or "separate" . . . "persecute"; "cast out your name as evil" . . . "speak all manner of evil"; "leap for joy" . . . "be exceeding glad"; "so" . . . "in like manner"—one might well believe arose from difference of translation.

Still the hypothesis of a Hebrew or Aramaic original, though it may explain some of the phenomena in question, is not capable of being carried through. For instance, it is refuted, not only by passages like that previously mentioned—Matthew vi. 25-33=Luke xii. 22-31, which lie outside the immediate context of the sermon as St. Luke gives it,—but also by passages like Matthew vii. 3-5=Luke vi. 41, 42, which lie within it. And even if it were possible to suppose that the two evangelists were giving independent versions of a common Semitic original, even that would not explain the whole of the facts. It would bring us no nearer to understanding why St. Matthew should have a series of eight beatitudes and St. Luke substitute for this four pronouncements of blessing and four of woe.

And yet I hesitate equally to think that the difference is due merely to a free handling of a common original by either of our evangelists. We have seen that there are many places in which St. Luke keeps closely enough to his text; the changes which he introduces into it are not of so far-reaching a kind. But apart from that, we can ill afford to lose either of the two versions; on neither can we lay the hand and say, This is unworthy of the author to whom it is ascribed. In regard to both we have the same difficulty in supposing that any one but Jesus could have so spoken. They present truths complementary to each other—truths allied in their essence, though seen, as it were, from a different angle.

The conclusion therefore to which I incline is that which I understand to be also favoured by Dr. Ewald. I believe that the beatitudes originally stood in the *Logia* in a form not dissimilar from that in which we have a Greek version of them in St. Matthew. I believe that St. Luke also had access to the *Logia*; and I find it hard to doubt that in some places, at least, if not in this, he had access even to the same Greek version.¹ But I suspect that here, and very probably elsewhere, he also had before him some other document—entirely independent of the *Logia*—which contained a discourse spoken originally on some other occasion, but yet so like the sermon on the mount as to be identified with it by St. Luke. That evangelist seems to have given us, not either discourse singly or separately, but the two fused together, the language and expression of the discourse peculiar to himself predominating.

It is at least conceivable that St. Luke's enlarged version of the call of the four apostles (v. 1-11) may be a combination of the Synoptic narrative with a tradition similar to that of St. John xxi. 1-11. No doubt the two accounts read now as if they referred to different events; but we may imagine St. Luke partly drawing upon written documents, partly collecting by word of mouth stories detached from their context, and not always perhaps quite at first hand. Among these latter there came to him one which seemed to fit in with the call of the apostles; and he placed it there, interweaving it with the framework supplied to him by St. Mark.

I would not say more than that this is a *conceivable* explanation. How far it is also *probable* will depend upon the conclusion we are led to form as to St. Luke's historical method generally—a conclusion which would be better

¹ So too Wendt, *Lehre Jesu*, i., p. 45.

reserved until we have reached a further point in the study of the Synoptic problem than we have at present. As yet we do not deal with assured results, but only with working hypotheses.

W. SANDAY.

SURVEY OF RECENT ENGLISH LITERATURE
ON THE NEW TESTAMENT.

MISCELLANEOUS.—Dr. James Morison, whose commentaries on the first two gospels have met with so wide an acceptance, having completed a fifty years' ministry, has been asked to issue a memorial volume of sermons. This we have in his *Sheaves of Ministry* (Hodder & Stoughton). As might be expected, they are doctrinal, but in thoroughly good taste and temper. In the sermon which may be considered the heart of the volume, "Does God fix Everything?" Dr. Morison ignores the explanations offered by Calvinists, and the replies they have made to the charge that they make God the only sinner. In a popular sermon this course was excusable and legitimate; but the wisdom of publishing so barely one-sided a statement on a disputed topic may be questioned. In another sermon, in order to escape Calvinistic foreordination, he resorts to the expedient of interpreting the words, "as many as were ordained to eternal life," as meaning, "as many as were self-addicted to the things that naturally issue in eternal life." It is this kind of thing that scares wavering Calvinists, and hurries them back to their Calvinism. Dr. Morison cannot find in Scripture any "larger hope." His method of harmonizing Paul and James is scarcely what might have been looked for from an exegete of repute; and his sermon on the Bible, "The Book of God," evades all the questions which at present exercise theologians. Many of the sermons are useful, and give clear and sufficient definitions of important truths.—A serious and thoughtful exposition of the Lord's Prayer comes to us from Canada: *Our Father's Kingdom*, by the Rev. Charles B. Ross, M.A., B.D. (T. & T. Clark). The twelve lectures in this volume must have been listened to with profit; they are sensible, and they strive to bring Christian faith into contact with life and social needs.

Two volumes on the life of Christ deserve notice. Principal Wace has collected into a volume a number of papers he had contributed to the *Clergyman's Magazine*, and issues it with the attractive, if non-mathematical, title, *Some Central Points of our Lord's Ministry* (Hodder & Stoughton). The papers are not so suggestive as Dr. Wace by his previous writings has led us to expect; but they are, it need not be said, carefully thought out

and, if accepted as sermons, must take high rank. They are devout, reverential, thoughtful meditations on important themes, and were worthy of the pulpit of Lincoln's Inn Chapel, where they were first delivered.—*Pastor Pastorum; or, The Schooling of the Apostles by our Lord*, is the title of a volume by the Rev. Henry Latham, M.A., Master of Trinity Hall, Cambridge (Deighton, Bell & Co.), and has grown out of five and thirty years of college work. Mr. Latham has done well to publish this volume; for, although it is curiously incomplete, yet the points which are treated are handled with insight and originality. As an evidence of the independence of the author, it may be mentioned that, although one of the great books of this generation is occupied with the same theme, there is no trace of its influence from beginning to end of Mr. Latham's volume. Proceeding upon the idea that the training of the apostles was a very principal object in our Lord's ministry, he endeavours to trace the method and principles acted upon. For this purpose he examines the call of the apostles, showing how our Lord respected their freedom of choice, and selected agents suitable for the work He wished them to do; how He taught them by parable and miracle, and gave them also a practical training. Every one who has pursued similar lines of thought will gladly acknowledge that, if Mr. Latham omits matters essential to completeness of treatment, and if he occasionally introduces ideas that are familiar, he much more frequently lets fall a pencil of clearest illumination on points which hitherto have escaped notice. His "Chronological Appendix" will also be found useful, although a most unfortunate misprint at the beginning of it represents our Lord as being born in A.U.C. 753 instead of 750.

That Charles Kingsley's volume of sermons entitled *The Good News of God* should have run through eleven editions since 1863 will surprise no one and will gratify many. Other sermons of the same preacher which have attained great popularity are those entitled *The Gospel of the Pentateuch* and those on *David*, which are now included in one cheap and pretty volume. The volume *Discipline and other Sermons* has also a good record, and is now re-issued in this attractive edition, which is meant to range with the novels and other writings of the manly and genial rector of Eversley, now being issued by Messrs. Macmillan. Not less than in his novels did Kingsley reveal a fertile mind and an ardent spirit. In their combination of profundity of thought with sim-

plicity of exposition his sermons stand alone. They are always flowing and rhythmical, even musical in language; and, indeed, the sermon on "Music" is a *tour de force*, remarkably illustrating how the subject of a discourse can dominate its style.—A third volume of *Notes of Sermons*, by the late missionary-bishop, Dr. Steere (George Bell & Sons), deserves a heartier welcome than most collections of skeleton sermons. There is really life in these, but the essential uselessness of such notes is unconsciously illustrated in the anecdote, told in the preface, of a reporter (falsely so called), who adopted the easy method prevalent among his class of asking for the preacher's manuscript, and was presented with an old envelope with one word jotted down upon it.—Another bunch of homiletical germs is by Mr. John Harries, *Does God break His Pledges?* (Elliot Stock.) If they fall into congenial soil, they may germinate.—In the Rev. Nathaniel Dimock's *Doctrine of the Death of Christ* (Elliot Stock), an enormous amount of more or less relevant matter is brought together. A very complete *catena* of passages from Polycarp to the *Theologia Germanica* is itself a contribution of value. There are also exegetical annotations on all the passages of Scripture bearing on the atonement. Mr. Dimock writes in the interest of the traditional view; but even although his conclusions may not at all times be acceptable to the reader, the material adduced cannot but be useful to the inquirer. But it is not learning that is now needed for the solution of the difficulties which surround the atonement. Of learning there is in this volume rather a superfluity than a lack; but Mr. Dimock does not seem to have himself felt the difficulties he seeks to remove, and it is simply impossible that an unsympathetic reasoner can bring light to the groping mind. Especially does Mr. Dimock reveal incapacity when he endeavours to show the relation of the atonement to the incarnation. The Apostle John would not endorse his statements on this point.—Another keenly orthodox volume rendered useless by a similar want of perception is *The New Apologetic; or, The Down-grade in Criticism, Theology, and Science*, by Prof. Watts, of Belfast (T. & T. Clark). The "down-grade" is represented by Bushnell, Farrar, Drummond, Bruce, and such like. Dr. Watts is one of those unhappily constituted men who cannot write unless they are angry. He needs the red rag to excite him; and this time he follows the lead of Mr. Spurgeon, and has brought himself up to fighting

point by the imagination that the whole theological world is swiftly rushing to destruction, and that Dr. Watts alone can save it. He is a clever logician, deftly manipulating theological formulæ; but whether these have any relation to reality he never inquires. There is no evidence from board to board of this volume that he has ever seriously pondered the matters he discusses. He is essentially an advocate, not a judge. He belongs, craving Horace's pardon, to the *irritabile genus disputatorum*.—We are glad to notice that Messrs. Maclehose, of Glasgow, have issued a second volume of the late Dr. Leckie's sermons, with a brief memoir. Dr. Leckie had a delicacy of fancy, a directness of spiritual insight, and a felicity of exposition unsurpassed in this generation of preachers.—To the "Men of the Bible" series, Prof. Iverach, of Aberdeen, has added a volume on *Paul*, in which the fruit of much reading and study is presented. The masculine thinking, and theological intelligence, and critical acuteness, which characterize the writings of Prof. Iverach are abundantly present in this little book.

We have also received from Messrs. Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co. the new volume of their "Pulpit Commentary." It is on the *Epistle to the Romans*. The exposition has been written by the Rev. J. Barmby, B.D., and is characterized by considerable insight and vigour, and by adequate scholarship. The homiletics have been entrusted to Prof. J. Radford Thomson and others.

MARCUS DODS.

GLYCERIUS THE DEACON.

THE STORY OF A HERESY.¹

A CLASSICAL scholar owes an apology to the society for presuming to address it on such a subject; but you will probably all agree with me that, if Dr. Westcott thought I might have something to say worth the time that he and you devote to me, it was right for me to take his wish for an injunction. I am also buoyed up by the belief that, if I have anything worth saying, you will see in it a proof that great results may be expected for the history of society, and of the influence that Christianity exercised on it in early times, from systematic exploration of the Eastern lands by competent travellers. Everything that I have to say, every idea that I have on the subject, is gained from study of the documents that I have myself found in the country, and which I was in honour obliged, at first much against my own will, to edit. The subject lay quite apart from the sphere of my previous interests and studies, and also far apart from the work which has been required by my situation in life.

In so far as I fail to carry conviction to your minds, I shall be only too grateful for criticism. In treading on ground unfamiliar to me, I lack the surefootedness of the specialist in his own department. I know well that year-

¹ The following paper was read, nearly *verbatim* as here printed, to the Cambridge Clerical Society on October 17th, 1889. It was intended for publication; but want of time to complete many sentences, of which only the first half was written, and to add a few notes and occasional sentences, has delayed the publication. The paper, being addressed to a university audience, takes in part the form of a plea for a wider range of classical studies.

long familiarity with a subject in all its aspects is needed in order to use the exactly correct words that shall express one's meaning and no more: seeking to avoid one error, the unwary scholar passes into the opposite error; writing from one point of view, he is unconscious of the effect of his words from another. In so far then as I want that sureness of touch that long familiarity with the subject alone gives, I shelter myself behind Dr. Westcott's invitation.

There has existed, and even still exists, a wide-spread opinion that such subjects as I wish to place before you lie out of the pale of what is called humane letters, and that the classical scholar has nothing to do with them. But we are all only too prone to bound the realm of humane letters by the limits of our individual interests; and the terms "narrow" and "specialist," as some of us occasionally use them, mean simply that the so called "specialist" finds some interest beyond the limits of our traditional circle. But probably it is unnecessary, in the university where J. E. B. Mayor is professor, to plead that a classical scholar may justifiably spend some part of his time in reading such authors as Cyprian or Tertullian as interpreters of the society in which they lived, or such authors as Basil of Cæsareia or Gregory of Nazianzos, if he wishes to understand the history of Roman Asia Minor. In becoming Christians, these writers did not cease to be men: they only found that element of thoroughness, sincerity, and enthusiasm, the want of which is so unpleasant in later classical literature; and if they directed these qualities into different channels from those which are most natural now, every unusual direction of our common human nature must be studied and explained by the circumstances of its time. History only deepens in intensity and interest as we pass from the classical and come down towards the present time. The only reason why it sometimes appears less interesting is that the strands of life become more numerous as time

goes on, and the effort to comprehend them separately, and bring them together in the mind to form the complicated thread of human history, grows more serious.

There are many interests of the most fascinating kind in the history of the Roman empire, when we turn away from the battles and sieges, the murders and suicides, the crimes of one emperor and the lofty character of another—in short, from all the great things of history. The machinery by which for the first time in human history there was constructed a great and stable empire, more permanent than the strong arm of the despot who held it together; the remarkable system by which such a splendid series of provincial administrators was produced and trained, administrators of whom one of the greatest scholars Cambridge has ever produced—a scholar whom we all grudge to the politics that absorb him—says that we can among them find examples occasionally of cruelty, occasionally of rapacity, but never of incompetence: ¹ that magnificent system is a fascinating study, but it is inferior in human interest to the study of social phenomena. The widest democracy of ancient times was a narrow oligarchy in comparison with our modern states. But the ideas which have realized themselves among us as the rights of the poorest and lowest classes were at work under the Roman empire; and the central point in the study of Roman imperial society is the conflict of the new religion with the old. By a study of Roman imperial society, I do not of course mean superficial talk about Juvenal and the society he describes. What Juvenal considered to be society was merely the slowly dying governing caste of earlier Rome, the nobles who had conquered the world, who had long maintained their pre-eminence by absorbing into their number every person of vigour and power enough to raise him above the level of the lower class, but who at last paid the penalty,

¹ Waddington, *Fastes des Provinces Asiatiques*, p. 18.

which every privileged class seems always to pay, in corruption and gradual death. Tacitus and Juvenal paint the deathbed of pagan Rome; they have no eyes to see the growth of new Rome, with its universal citizenship, its universal Church (first of the emperors, afterwards of Christ), its "alimentations," its care for the orphan and the foundling, its recognition of the duty of the State to see that every one of its members is fed. The empire outraged the old republican tradition, that the provincial was naturally inferior to the Roman;¹ but this, which was its greatest crime in the eyes of Tacitus, is precisely what constitutes its importance in the history of the world. What we are in search of is the historian who will show us the state of things beyond the exclusive circle of aristocratic society, among the working classes and the thinking classes, and who will discuss the relation between the Christian and his next-door neighbour who sacrificed to Rome and the emperor, and amused himself with the pageantry of Jupiter and Artemis. I want to be shown what the middle classes of the community were doing, and still more what they were thinking. I care little for the university scholar, who immured himself in the university, and dabbled in elegant literature and gave showy lectures; but I want to see the man of high university training who went out to move the world. I get little for my purpose among the pagan writers; and I must go to the Christian writers, whom I find full of social enthusiasm, though expressed in strange and to me sometimes repellent forms. They weary me often with doctrine, when I want humanity; but even beneath their doctrine the man appears, and when they

¹ On Horace's protest against this tendency of the empire, of which he was vaguely conscious, see Mommsen's speech to the Berlin Academy on the birthday of the two emperors, Frederick and William II., in the year 1889. Horace, though an adherent of Octavian, never really abandoned his old republican view: he admired Augustus as the restorer of old Rome, not as the maker of new Rome.

condescend to the affairs of the world, they are instinct with burning human feeling.

I want then for a time to take Church history out of the theological domain, and have it written from another point of view. When it is treated by writers whose interests are either theological or anti-theological, there is inevitably a tendency to treat controversies between sects and struggles between opposing churches as a matter purely of religious dogma. The diversities of opinion on points of doctrine, often sufficiently minute points, are related in great detail, by the theologians with the interest of love, by the anti-theologians with the interest of ridicule. But, to take an example from my own country, the historian of Scotland who described the differences of doctrine, often barely discernible by the naked eye, between our innumerable sects, and left the reader to infer that these were the sole, or even the chief, causes of division between the sects, would give a very inadequate picture of the facts. He must also describe and explain many social and political differences; *e.g.* he must not leave his readers ignorant of the fact that one church as a body took one political side, another as a body took the opposite side.

So in earlier Church history, it has often been the case that differences of race or manners were the cause of division between churches and sects, and slight differences of doctrine or ritual were merely badges on the banners of armies already arrayed against each other. I do not maintain that this is the whole matter, I do not even say that it is the chief matter; but I do say that it is a side that deserves and will reward study, and that it has not yet received its fair share of attention.

To come to the particular case of the country with which I am most familiar, we want to catch the Cappadocian Christian of the fourth century, the Phrygian Christian of the second and third centuries, and to acquire some con-

ception of his character, his ways, and his thoughts, and how he got on with his non-Christian neighbours. In studying this subject, I have been gradually led to the opinion that a distinction must be drawn among the Christians. In the period between 150 and 400, the history of Christianity in Asia Minor, when treated as a branch of the history of society, is a long conflict between two opposing tendencies, or, as they may be called, sects or churches. I desire to avoid the use of the term orthodox for one of these churches and heretic for the other. One of these churches was of native growth, the other represented the dominant tone of the Christian world; one was loose in organization and separatist in character, the other was strictly organized and vigorously directed to secure absolute uniformity of the Church in all parts of the world; one was the native provincial church, the other was the Roman church.

From the theological point of view, these provincial churches are divided into many classes and called by many names; but they have all one feature, they tended towards separatism and diversity, in opposition to the unity of the Church catholic, which was the guiding principle of the Roman church.

In these remarks I use the term Roman church, not in any doctrinal sense, but as indicating the whole body of Christians who looked to Rome as the governing centre of the Church. Some of the characteristics which I imagined to have belonged to that church will be brought out in the course of the following remarks, in which I attempt to indicate some small part of its action and influence in Asia Minor.

The history of the Roman church has varied greatly in different districts of Asia Minor. In some it never touched the popular heart, and was barely maintained by external influence; in others it achieved an easy victory; and in

some cases only a faint echo of any conflict has reached us. My position is, that there was, in every case throughout Asia Minor where any evidence is known, such a conflict; that the first Christians of the country did not look to Rome as centre and head of the Church; that they were not organized in a strict fashion, but were looser communities, in which personal influence counted for much and official station for little; and that the careful and strict discipline of the Roman church put a stop to the disintegrating tendency, in a political and a religious point of view alike, of the provincial churches, organized the whole Church in a strict hierarchy of territorial character, parallel to the civil organization, and enabled the Church to hold together the Roman empire more firmly than the worship of the emperors could ever do.¹

We should gladly be able to answer the question why some districts of Asia Minor should have resisted the Roman church so persistently, and others have adopted it so readily; why, *e.g.*, if I may use the question-begging terms, Cappadocia was orthodox and Phrygia heretical.

The answer seems obvious in the case of Cappadocia. The group of great Church leaders, Basil, Amphilochius, and the three Gregories (for I think Gregory, the bishop of Nazianzos, may fairly rank along with his far more famous son),—this group of leaders carried the country with them. But this answer only puts the difficulty one step back: can any reason be suggested why the great Cappadocian leaders followed the Roman church, whereas the most striking figures in Phrygian ecclesiastical history opposed it?

¹ The modern Greek people has been held together through centuries of slavery, not by the tie of blood, for we find Cappadocians, Pisidians, Isaurians (the last only in one single tiny village, unknown to the geographers and travellers), Albanians, etc., all united in feeling as Greeks, nor by the tie of language, for the larger number of Greek communities either lost their Greek for Turkish, or never even knew Greek, but only Albanian: it has been held together solely by the Church.

The history of Basil of Cæsareia, Gregory of Nyssa, and the distinguished family to which they belonged is closely connected with the city of Iborá in Pontos. A glance at the biography of the various members of the family shows that a number of questions with regard to the circumstances of their life, and the exact meaning to be placed on the language of many of their letters and of the incidents they describe, depend on the locality and surroundings. But the name Iborá is still floating in air, and has not set foot on the ground; and for all reasoning that depends on local circumstances, on the relation of city with city, district with district, and civil governors or bishops with each other, it would be as useful to say that Basil's family owned an estate beside Cloud-Cuckoo-Town, as to say that they were landed proprietors near Iborá. But any one who attempts the task of reconstructing a picture of the society in which Basil, the Gregories, and Amphilochius moved, and their relations with it; the state of education in the country, and the attitude which young graduates of the University of Athens assumed to the home-trained Cappadocians or Pontians—an historian of that class, when such a one arises, will find many investigations stopped by uncertainty as to the situations in which events were transacted. The operations of the English Asia Minor Exploration Fund have now cleared away much of the uncertainty that hung over the localities in which the great events of Cappadocian religious history took place, and have made it possible to face fairly the problem of describing the circumstances of this critical period, 350–400, when the character of the Cappadocian church was determined. Here is a period about which a great body of evidence remains in the writings of the principal agents on the victorious side. Their account of their opponents, of course, has to be accepted with caution; but in weighing it we can, at least, always have the cer-

tainty that they are not too lenient in their judgment, or flattering in their description, of the opposite party.

In the year 370 Basil was appointed bishop of Cæsareia, metropolitan of Cappadocia, and exarch or patriarch of the Pontic *diocesis*. He was appointed in spite of the resistance of the majority of his bishops, in spite of the dislike and dread of many of the people, in spite of the open opposition of the government. He was elected by the strenuous exertions of a few influential individuals; and the authority of the Church outside the province was needed in order to put down the disaffected within it. The cause of the catholic Church was involved in his election; without the hand of a vigorous organizer there was extreme danger that "heresy"—Eunomianism, Arianism, and so on—would triumph in Cappadocia. We want to learn what this means to the student of society. Did the Eunomian differ from the Catholic only in certain points of doctrine, being otherwise undistinguishable from him? or do these words indicate a difference in private life, in political feeling, and in Church organization? The question may be answered fully, when the historian is found who will face the problem as it has just been sketched. I can only express the hope that in this university something may be done to solve it. The later Greek and Latin writers are full of material uncollected and unvalued for the history of society. Why should almost all the natural ability and admirable training of the classical scholars of Cambridge be directed towards such a narrow range of authors? Every one who has toiled through a Byzantine historian in the edition of the Berlin Academy—that *dauernde Schande der deutschen Philologie*—compelled, as he does so, slowly and without critical material, to remake his edition for his own use, and has then run joyously through De Boor's admirable Theophanes, every one who has done that knows what need

there is for the wider employment of learning and skill. Why should traditional belief—or, shall I say, traditional ignorance?—exclude all Christian Fathers or Byzantine historians from the classical scholar's interests, and almost confine him to producing the 143rd edition of one out of about a score of writers? When he has got something to say about Homer or Cicero that he must say, then let him say it; but might not some of the good scholarship of this university be more profitably employed? I am not ungrateful for the large amount of help that I have had from Cambridge scholarship, but what I have had only makes me wish for more.

I shall try to give an example of the human interest of this subject by examining one single episode in Cappadocian history, about 371–374, and showing what light is thrown by it on the character of the Cappadocian Christians at the time. The incident is related by Archdeacon Farrar in his *Lives of the Fathers* as follows. His account agrees with that given by Canon Venables in the *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, with Tillemont, and with the Migne biography; and may be taken fairly as representing the usual interpretation.

“The extraordinary story of the deacon Glycerius illustrates the aberrations due to the fermenting enthusiasm and speculative curiosity which marked the Eastern church, and which were fostered by the dreamy idleness of innumerable monks. Glycerius was a young man whose early vigour Basil viewed with so much favour, that he had ordained him deacon of the church of Venesa (?) about 372. Puffed up by his ordination, the young deacon proceeded to gather round him a band of devoted young ladies, whose admiration he won by sleek and soft religious arts, and who supported him by their offerings. Severely reproved by his presbyter, his *chorepiscopus*, and lastly by Basil, Glycerius left the town by night with a band of these girls and some youths, and scandalized the country by wandering about with them in a disorderly manner, dancing and singing hymns, amid the jeers of the coarse rustics. When their fathers came to rescue the girls, Glycerius ignominiously drove them away. Finally, the whole band took refuge with a bishop named Gregory, whom even the Benedictine

editor is inclined to think *may* have been Gregory of Nyssa. Basil treated the vain, mischievous, and deluded deacon with much fatherly forbearance, and promised to deal with him kindly if he would dismiss the votaries he was leading, not to God, but to the abyss. Strange to say, the bishop, whoever he was, either failed to second Basil's efforts, or only did so in a lukewarm and inadequate way."

Let me now read to you the letters from which all our knowledge has to be gathered. I hope that, through my bald translation, something of the fire and vigour of the original may appear. Few writers can compare with Basil in directness: not a word can be spared without a distinct loss of effect. He does indeed use *iva* with conjunctive in a way to make a classical scholar's hair stand on end; but if classical Greek disdained the usage, so much the worse for classical Greek.¹ It is true that it does not occur in Demosthenes, but it is stamped by a greater than that man of words, the man least capable of understanding his time of all that have ever paraded in history as statesmen.

I. BASIL TO GREGORY (EP. CLXIX. [CCCCXII.]).

THOU hast taken a reasonable and kindly and compassionate course in showing hospitality to the captives of the mutineer Glycerius (I assume the epithet for the moment) and in veiling our common disgrace so far as possible. But when thy discretion has learned the facts with regard to him, it is becoming that thou shouldst put an end to the scandal. This Glycerius who now parades among you with such respectability was consecrated by ourselves as deacon of the Church of Venasa, to be a minister to the presbyter there and to attend to the work of the church; for though he is in other respects unmanageable, yet he is clever in doing whatever comes to his hand. But when he was appointed, he neglected the work as completely as if it had never existed. Gathering together a number of poor girls, on his own

¹ There is too great proneness to stamp one period of Latin, one period of one dialect of Greek, as correct, and everything that differs as wrong. But the real cause of the inferiority of style in later pagan writers lies, not in the words, but in the want of life and spirit in the men. The question has yet to be asked and answered, how far the language used by Basil is less fit to express clearly and vigorously his meaning than that used by Demosthenes.

authority and responsibility, some of them flocking voluntarily round him (for you know the flightiness of young people in such matters) and some of them unwilling, he set about making himself the leader of a company: and taking to himself the name and the garb of a patriarch, he of a sudden paraded as a great power, not reaching this position by a course of obedience and piety, but making it a livelihood, as one might take up any trade; and he has almost upturned the whole Church, disregarding his own presbyter, and disregarding the village-bishop and ourselves, too, as of no account, and ever filling the civil polity and the clerical estate with riot and disorder. And at last, when a slight reproof was given him by ourselves and by the village-bishop, with the intent that he should cease his mutinous conduct (for he was exciting young men to the same courses), he conceives a thing very audacious and unnatural. Impiously carrying off as many young women as he could, he runs away under the cover of night. This must seem to thee quite horrible.

Think too what the occasion was. The festival of Venasa was being celebrated, and as usual a vast crowd was flocking thither from all quarters. He led forth his chorus, marshalled by young men and circling in the dance, making the pious cast down their eyes, and rousing the ridicule of the ribald and loose-tongued. Nor is this all, serious as it is; but further, as I am informed, when the parents could not endure to be orphaned of their children, and wished to bring them home from the dispersion, and came as weeping suppliants to their own daughters, he insults and scandalises them, this admirable young fellow with his piratical discipline.

This ought to appear intolerable to thy discretion, for it brings us all into ridicule. The best thing is that thou shouldest order him to return with the young women, for he would meet with allowance if he comes with letters from thee. If that be impossible, the young women, at any rate, thou shalt send back to their mother the Church. Or, in the third place, do not allow them that are willing to return to be kept under compulsion, but persuade them to come back to us.

Otherwise we testify to thee, as we do to God and men, that this is a wrong thing, and against the rules of the Church. If Glycerius return with a spirit of wisdom and orderliness, that were best; but if not, he must be removed from the ministry.

II. BASIL TO GLYCERIUS (EP. CLXX. [CCCCIV.]).

How far wilt thou carry thy madness, working evil for thyself and disturbance for us, and outraging the common order of monks? Return then, trusting in God and in us, who imitate the compassion of God. For, though like a father we have chidden thee, yet we will

pardon thee like a father. Such are our words to thee, inasmuch as many supplicate for thee, and before all thy presbyter, whose gray hairs and kindly spirit we respect. But if thou continuest to absent thyself from us, thou art altogether cast out from thy station, and thou shalt be cast out from God with thy songs and thy raiment, by which thou ledest the young women, not towards God, but into the pit.

These two letters were obviously written at the same time, and sent by the same messenger; the third was written after an interval, and apparently after receipt of a letter from Gregory asking for assurance of pardon for Glycerius.

III. BASIL TO GREGORY (EP. CLXXI. [CCCCXIII.]).

I WROTE to thee already before this about Glycerius and the maidens. Yet they have never to this day returned, but are still delaying; nor do I know why and how, for I should not charge thee with doing this in order to cause slander against us, either being thyself annoyed with us or doing a favour to others.¹ Let them come then without fear; be thou guarantee on this point. For we are afflicted when the members of the Church are cut off, even though they be deservedly cut off. But if they should resist, the responsibility must rest on others, and we wash our hands of it.

For the right understanding of this incident the only evidence available is contained in (1) these three letters of Basil; (2) a sentence of Strabo (p. 537), describing the village and district of Venasa; (3) an inscription found in 1882 on a hill-top near the village; (4) the map of Cappadocia as now reconstructed. A first glance at the evidence is enough to reveal various details inconsistent with the authorized version; and we may be sure that Basil has not coloured in favour of Glycerius those details that give a different complexion to the incident.

In the first place, the very evident sympathy of Gregory for Glycerius disquiets all the modern interpreters; his sympathy cannot be due to ignorance of the facts of the

¹ The reference is to Basil's numerous enemies, who would be delighted that the bishop of Nazianzos should refuse to comply with his wishes.

case, for he was far closer to the spot than Basil himself, and the acts were not hid under a bushel, but done openly, and no doubt widely talked about. The only explanation that can be devised by the interpreters is to deny part of the evidence. The MS. evidence, so far as quoted in the Migne edition, is that two of the letters are addressed to Gregory of Nazianzos. Most of the interpreters say that Gregory of Nyssa must be meant, and that Gregory of Nyssa was guilty of many weak and foolish acts. The answer lies in the map, which confirms the old authority, and disproves the modern suggestion.¹

In the next place, the presbyter whom Basil represents as having been disregarded and set at naught is in favour of the offender, and beseeches Basil to act kindly to him. Canon Venables indeed says that the presbyter "gravely admonished" Glycerius; but this misrepresents the evidence. The "village-bishop" and Basil himself censured Glycerius; but though Basil says Glycerius showed disrespect to the presbyter, he drops no hint that the presbyter complained about this, but rather the opposite. Basil himself does not even hint at any darker crime than injudiciousness and ambition in the relations of Glycerius to the devotees; and there can be no doubt that the letters omit no charge that could be brought against the rebellious deacon. The evident purity of conduct in this strange band may fairly be taken as necessarily implying that the strictest religious obligations were observed by the devotees. In such a difficult situation, there is no alternative but either strict asceticism, springing from fanatical or enthusiastic

¹ If any change is permitted in the MS. authority, I should understand the elder Gregory, bishop of Nazianzos, and date the letters A.D. 373. At any rate this Gregory was obviously not under Basil's authority, and was therefore under Tyana; whereas Nyssa was under Cæsareia. The tone of the letters also is more respectful and less peremptory than Basil would probably have employed to his brother or his friend Gregory. On the map, see *Historical Geography of Asia Minor*, p. 293.

religious feeling, on the one hand, or license and scandal, on the other.

Now the evident sympathy both of the immediate superior, the presbyter, whose influence had been apparently diminished by the popularity of the deacon, and of the bishop of Nazianzos (whether the older Gregory or his son, who filled his place for a short time after his death in 374), is quite unintelligible if Glycerius had introduced some new and startling features into the religion of the province. It is of course certain that the principles of both the Gregories, father and son, were opposed to such manifestations, as being contrary to the whole spirit of the catholic Church. The reason why Gregory sympathised must be that Glycerius was only keeping up the customary ceremonial of a great religious meeting. Canon Venables indeed says that the band "wandered about the country under the pretence of religion, singing hymns and leaping and dancing in a disorderly fashion," and Archdeacon Farrar agrees with him. But there is no warrant in the letter of Basil for this account. The band is not said either to wander about the country or to dance in a disorderly way. Accurate geography is useful in studying ancient writers, but accurate translation is not without its advantages. Let us scrutinise the facts a little more closely, examining the situation and the probabilities of the case; and I think we shall have to admit that Basil is giving us a picture, coloured to his view, of a naïve and quaint ceremony of early Cappadocian Christianity, which he regarded with horror, and was resolved to stamp out.

One of the most striking features in the whole incident is the important part played by women. Now this is the most striking feature also in the native religion of Asia Minor. From their religion we may safely infer their social condition; and the inference is confirmed by many details

that have already often been collected and described, especially the Lycian custom of formally stating descent by the mother's name. The low position of women, the want of any religious station and duties for them, the general theory that women can do little good, but much harm—all this was a principle that grew stronger as time passed in the Roman church. On the other hand, the ministration of women, often in positions of great dignity and responsibility, is a feature of several of the provincial churches, or "heresies," in Asia Minor.

The occasion when the most extreme features of this Cappadocian "heresy" were displayed was the great festival at Venasa, when a vast concourse was gathered there. This festival is called by Canon Venables a "fair"; but this is not an accurate translation. The *synodos*, which was held there, was certainly similar to the Armenian *synodos*, held at Phargamous. At Phargamous, in the month of June, a great festival was held in honour of certain martyrs; and such dignitaries as Basil himself, Eusebius of Samosata, and Theodotus of Nicopolis, might be expected at it.

Moreover the *synodos* of Venasa was one of the most ancient and famous religious meetings in Cappadocia. The priest of Zeus at Venasa was second in dignity and power only to the priest of Komana; he held office for life, and was practically a king. A village inhabited by 3,000 *hierodouloi* was attached to the temple, and round it lay a sacred domain that brought in an annual income of fifteen talents (nearly £4,000). Christianity directed the religious feeling of the country towards new objects, but preserved the old seasons and methods. A Christian festival was substituted for the old festival of Zeus, doubtless the occasion when the god made his annual *ἐξοδος*, or procession round his country. Basil unluckily, pitiless of the modern scholar, does not name the month when the festival took place, and the sole memorials of it that remain to complete

the account of Strabo are, first, a brief invocation to the heavenly Zeus, found on a hill-top, to guide us (along with other evidence) to the situation; and, secondly, these letters of Basil, to show how the Cappadocian Christians developed the pagan festival.

At this great religious ceremony of the whole country, Glycerius brought forth his followers, singing and dancing in chorus. Such ceremonies were necessarily a part of the old religious festival of Zeus, and their existence in it, though not attested, may be safely assumed; accordingly there is every probability that they were not now first introduced by Glycerius, but were part of the regular Cappadocian custom. They are a natural and regular concomitant of the earlier and simpler forms of religion, whether pagan or Jewish; and at Venasa they were retained, with some modifications in the words and the gestures. Hymns undoubtedly were substituted for the pagan formulæ, and not a hint is dropped by Basil that the dancing and singing were not of a quiet and modest character. The license of the old pagan ceremonies had been given up; but in many respects there was no doubt a striking resemblance between the old pagan and the new Christian festival. Probably the dancing of the great dervish establishments of Kara Hissar and Iconium at the present day would give the best idea of the festival at Venasa in the time of Basil, though the solemnity and iconoclastic spirit of Mohammedanism have still further toned down the ecstasy and enthusiastic *abandon* of the old ritual. But the strange, weird music of the flute and cymbals, and the excited yet always orderly dancing, make the ceremony even yet the most entrancing and intoxicating that I have ever witnessed. We can through this analogy come to realize the power that might be acquired by a man of natural ability and religious fervour over numbers of young persons. This influence was increased by the character which Glycerius assumed and the

robes which he wore. In the old pagan festival the leader of the festival wore the dress and bore the name of the deity whom he represented. The custom is well-known both in Greece (where the Dionysos festival is the most familiar, but far from the sole, example) and in Asia Minor.¹ Glycerius, as Basil tells us, assumed the name and the dress of a "patriarch." The meaning which this bears to one who is not skilled in ecclesiastical history, and who cannot tell whether there may not be some peculiar profanity in it, is, that the custom of the festival continued to be that the director of ceremonies (who, like the modern dervish sheikh, never danced himself) was equipped in a style corresponding to the pagan priest, and assumed the character of the highest religious official, the patriarch.

But a new era began in Cappadocia when Basil became head of the church. It is obvious that abuses might readily, almost necessarily, creep into such ceremonies; and clearly the edict went forth that they must cease. Basil does not hint that any real abuses had occurred. He speaks only of the downcast looks of the pious spectators, and the jests of the ribald and loose-tongued; but he is clearly describing what he conceives to be the inevitable outcome of such ceremonies. The spirit of the Church, whose champion Basil was, was inexorably opposed to such exhibitions. For good or for evil, such prominence given to women in religious ceremonial was hateful to it. The influence acquired by a deacon, his assumption of the robes and name of a patriarch, were subversive of the strict discipline of the Roman church. The open association of a monk with a band of young women was contrary to the rules of the monastic order. The village-bishop, acting doubtless on previous general orders of his superior, reprimanded Glycerius, and his action was confirmed and enforced by Basil. Glycerius, when thus treated, took

¹ *E.g.*, at Pessinus the priest took *ex officio* the name Attis.

advantage of the recent changes which had curtailed the power of Basil. He crossed the frontier into the adjoining bishopric of Nazianzos, which was now included in the province of Second Cappadocia, under the metropolitan of Tyana. The young women that followed his ministrations fled with him ; and as Gregory received and sheltered them all, we cannot doubt that the flight was made in an orderly way, without scandal, and with the air of pious but persecuted Christians. Basil then complained to Gregory in the letter quoted. The reply of Gregory unfortunately has not been preserved ; but we can imagine that he gave a different version of the case, stated his views as to the character of Glycerius, and urged Basil to promise complete forgiveness on condition of the immediate return of all the fugitives.

We have the reply of Basil, giving the required assurance, though not with the best grace. One motive that evidently weighed with him was apprehension of the talk that he would give rise to if he continued an intolerant policy. Now all this is inconceivable except on the supposition that, according to the above description, Glycerius was acting in accordance with established custom and the general feeling of the Cappadocian church, while Basil was too hastily and sternly suppressing the custom of the country. The incipient schism, roused by the sternness of Basil, was healed by the mild mediation of Gregory.

The fault in Glycerius which most offended Basil was evidently his transgression of the Church discipline. The full significance of this can be grasped only in its connexion with the whole policy of Basil.

The powerful personality, the intense, uncompromising zeal, and the great practical ability of Basil were of the first consequence in insuring the triumph of the Roman church in Cappadocia. But one man, however powerful, cannot do everything by his own immediate effort, espe-

cially when his personal influence is interrupted by a too early death, as Basil's was. The organizing power which has always been so conspicuous a feature of the Roman church exercised as powerful an influence in Cappadocia as elsewhere. The organization which Basil left behind him completed his work. One great object of Basil's administration was to establish large ecclesiastical centres of two kinds: first, orphanages; and, secondly, monasteries. An orphanage was built in every district of his immense diocese; the one at Cæsareia, with its church, bishop's palace, and residences for clergy, hospices for poor, sick, and travellers, hospital for lepers, and workshops for teaching and practising trades, was so large as to be called the "New City." Such establishments constituted centres from which the irresistible influence of the Church permeated the whole district, as, centuries before, the cities founded by the Greek kings had been centres from which the Greek influence had slowly penetrated over the country round. The monks and the monasteries, which Basil established widely over the country, were centres of the same influence; and though the monks occasionally caused some trouble by finding even Basil himself not sufficiently orthodox, they were probably powerful agents of the Roman church, whereas the solitary hermits and anchorets, whom Basil rather discouraged, though he had been one himself, were perhaps more favourable to the provincial Church, and were certainly a far less powerful engine for affecting the country.

That the monk Glycerius should break through the gradations of office and the spirit of the Church, should parade in the robes of the patriarch, and flee from his superior's jurisdiction in the company of a band of women, was a thing intolerable to Basil.

One other point requires notice: is any external circumstance known that is likely to have directed such men

as Basil towards the Roman church? A strong impulse probably was given them by their foreign education. They lost the narrow, provincial tone; they came to appreciate the unity and majesty of the Roman empire; they realized the destiny of the Church to be the religion of the empire, *i.e.* of the world. They also learned something about that organization by which Rome ruled the world, and they appreciated the fact that the Church could fulfil its destiny and rule the Roman empire only by strict organization and rigid discipline. Men like Glycerius could not see beyond the bounds of their native district, with its provincial peculiarities; men like Basil were perhaps almost intolerant of mere provincialism.

Perhaps a clearer idea of the causes which made Cappadocia orthodox may be gained by looking at Phrygia, which was mainly a heretical country. The cities of the Lycus valley, and of the country immediately east and north-east of it, which were most under the Roman influence, were of the dominant Christian church; but the mass of the country adhered stubbornly to the native forms of Christianity. Probably this has something to do with the fact that in Phrygia so few Christian communities have maintained an unbroken existence through the Turkish domination, while in Cappadocia a fair proportion of the whole population has preserved its religion to the present day. Many of the Phrygians were always discontented with the Byzantine rule, except under the iconoclast emperors. When John Comnenus was invading the Seljuk dominions, he found Christian communities, who so much preferred Turkish rule to Byzantine, that they fought against him, even without support from the Turks, and had to be reduced by force of arms. To a certain extent this was perhaps due to preference of the easy Seljuk yoke to the heavy Byzantine taxation; but it is very probable that religious difference was the chief cause.

How far then can we trace in Phrygia the presence or absence of the causes that made Cappadocia orthodox? In the first place, little trace of such organization as Basil made in Cappadocia can be found in Phrygia. In the life of Hypatius, written by his disciple Callinicus, and corrected by another hand in the time of his third successor, we read that he was born in Phrygia, but was obliged to emigrate to Thrace in order to gratify his wish to live in a church or monastery where he might associate with discreet men; "for there were then no such persons, except isolated individuals, in Phrygia, and if a church existed anywhere, the clergy were rustic and ignorant, though the country has since become almost entirely Christian" (*i.e.* orthodox).

Hypatius flourished in the first half of the fifth century; so that the apparent reform here described belongs to the period 450-500.¹ The organization of Phrygia on the orthodox model therefore is much later than that of Cappadocia, and it was probably not so thorough. It seems only to have been superficial, caused by the government imposing on the country the forms of the catholic Church.

The inscriptions of Phrygia carry back our knowledge of the history of Christianity there more than a century and a half earlier than in Cappadocia. In Phrygia, in the period 150 to 200 A.D., the struggle between the native church and the Roman church, known as the Montanist controversy, was in progress. The prophetesses of Montanism may be compared with the dancing devotees of Glycerius. Though there was no doubt a difference of doctrine between Glycerius and Montanus, corresponding to the difference of period, when varying points were the centre of controversy, yet Glycerianism was a growth of the same general type as

¹ The revision of the biography as composed by Callinicus is said expressly to have extended only to a correction of the bad Greek of a Syrian dialect. The reviser neither added nor took away anything, though he knew various things that might be added (*Acta Sanct.*, June 17th, p. 308 [248]).

Montanism, and might have become important in religious history, if it had not been cut short by the energy of Basil and the tolerance of Gregory.

There remains to us a document of the Montanist controversy, of the highest interest and of indubitable authenticity; for part of it has come down to us on the stone on which it was originally written. It is the testament of one of the prominent figures in the controversy; it was written by him when he felt the end of life approaching, and wished to leave behind him, before the eyes of men, a testimony, brief, clear, emphatic, of the truth for which he contended. In a document like this we may be sure that no word is wasted, no idea expressed that did not appear to the writer to be of critical importance. He had the words engraved, under his own eye, on his tombstone. I do not pretend to understand all that the writer put into the few rugged, but vigorous lines: what I long for is to see them treated thoroughly by the competent hand.¹ But the circumstances I think are alone sufficient to prove that my estimate of the importance of the document is not exaggerated.

I refer to the epitaph of Avircius Marcellus, engraved about 192 A.D. The restoration and interpretation of the text are still a matter of controversy; but I feel confident that the outline given in *THE EXPOSITOR*, 1889, vol. ix., pp. 265-272, approximates more closely than any other to the truth. In particular, growing experience makes me feel only more strongly that a Phrygian bearing the names Avircius (known only in Latin inscriptions of Rome and Gaul) and Marcellus must have been of Italian origin, and have borne also the prænomen of a Roman.

The epitaph of Avircius lays great stress on his travel and experience. After the introductory reference to the spotless Shepherd, he mentions the education which that Shepherd had given him, and describes it in detail. The

¹ The wish cannot now be fulfilled, since Bishop Lightfoot died.

first point in the education is "He sent me to Rome to see the mystic King, and the Church the Queen." It is impossible to mistake, and difficult perhaps to exaggerate the stress which Avircius lays on the name Rome. An omission too is almost equally significant: he travelled in Syria, and saw all its cities, but Jerusalem is not named, only Nisibis. The extreme limit of the Roman power suggests the one name that he actually gives. Avircius went to the metropolis and the extreme east of the empire; and that which struck him most is the unity of the Church. Everywhere he found the Christians united in the same belief and practice with himself. Basil, who had the eye of the governor and administrator, would probably, had he left us such a testament as Avircius has written, not have omitted some reference to the order, the rule, and organization, τὸ κοινὸν διάταγμα, of the Church. Avircius is deeply impressed with its unity, but does not realize the means by which that unity can be carried out in practice. He emphasises it in his testament, describes its doctrines and its mysteries—the writings of Paul, faith as the guide of life and Christ as its food, the immaculate virgin, and the holy sacrament; but he is silent as to its power. No touch indicates how it is to be made universal, except that he declines the prayers of those who disagree with him. The contrast between this last touch and the lenience which Basil was induced to show to Glycerius suggests part of the reason why Avircius could not carry Phrygia with him, while Basil could carry Cappadocia.¹

W. M. RAMSAY.

¹ Not directly, but by implication.

A SURVEY OF THE SYNOPTIC QUESTION.

IV. NEW HYPOTHESES.

So far as we have yet gone, the most recent literature on the Synoptic Gospels is seen to be still moving in the grooves which were, broadly speaking, traced for it by Holtzmann in 1863. It has however, at the same time, a more novel element, which perhaps strikes the attention all the more because of the amount of coincidence between several writers widely apart from each other, and approaching the subject without any kind of concert or communication. This is enough to show that there is a tendency in the air, though I must not be supposed to imply that the theories which are the subject of this coincidence are either as yet made good or even that they are likely to maintain themselves permanently.

Let us begin with Mr. Wright. Mr. Wright holds that our present Gospels, as we have them, were written within the decade 71-80 A.D. So far he is only adopting what, if we look at other countries besides England, might be described as, on the whole, the prevalent view. But then he goes beyond this, and he proceeds to date as well the other documents which are worked up in our Gospels. The first cycle of teaching, of which he speaks as compiled by St. Peter, he would place within twelve years of the ascension; for the second cycle, which he believes to have been brought into shape by St. Matthew, and the third cycle, which is supposed to contain, not the whole, but a considerable portion of the peculiar matter now found in St. Luke, he requires some twelve years more. It may be remembered that some MSS. of the Gospels, the oldest of which is Cod. Cyprius (K), of the ninth century, assign dates to our Gospels: to St. Matthew eight years after the ascension, to St. Mark ten (or on another reckoning twelve), and to St

Luke fifteen. Mr. Wright makes no appeal to these: his reason for fixing upon the twelfth year after the ascension is that he takes that as the date of the dispersion of the apostles—following, I suppose, the tradition, which was already of some standing at the end of the second century.¹ He supports this date partly by the general argument that by this time regular catechizing had begun—which we may more or less grant; partly by another argument, of which I think we shall do well to take note, without altogether committing ourselves to it, that if our Gospels were written when we imagine them to be written, “the very early date of the first cycle becomes a necessity, or we shall not have time to account for the great divergences which confessedly exist in our three editions of it.” But when he goes on to claim the support of Papias, I am afraid that he is misinterpreting the tradition which we owe to that writer. Mr. Wright speaks of St. Mark as the “chief of the catechists” at Jerusalem; and he appears to think of him as making the notes on which his Gospel is based at the time when St. Peter left that city. But Irenæus says expressly that St. Mark did not write down his notes of St. Peter’s preaching until after the death of the apostle. And in any case I have no doubt that the preaching of St. Peter in question belongs to the end of the apostle’s life, when St. Mark was again in his company, and not to the first part of his career, before the break up of the apostolic circle. The same tradition which connects St. Mark’s Gospel with St. Peter also connects it, not with Jerusalem, but Rome.

We observe, further, that Mr. Wright places first the historic Gospel, the record of things “said and done,” the Petrine Memoirs, and not the Matthæan collection of discourses. It will appear in the sequel that I regard this as the less promising form of the hypothesis.

¹ Lipsius, *Apokr. Apostelgesch.*, i., 13 f.

While then I am much inclined to agree with the broad lines of the analysis of the Gospels as Mr. Wright has traced them, I cannot attach much importance to the particular feature in his theory which has the greatest amount of novelty, his bold assignment of a date to the first committal of the Petrine Memoirs to writing. We are however reminded of another attempt, made some few years ago, to penetrate behind our canonical texts to the earlier history of those Memoirs. It was in 1884 that Dr. Edwin A. Abbott and Mr. W. G. Rushbrooke brought out their little work on *The Common Tradition of the Synoptic Gospels*. The introduction contained a somewhat peculiar theory as to the nature of that tradition, which has not so far been received very favourably. Dr. Abbott held that the original form of the tradition corresponded nearly to the actual words that are common to our three Synoptics, and that it included little more than these. The notes of which it was composed were thus so terse and brief that, "like a modern telegram," they had to be expanded before they became intelligible; and the divergences between the Gospels arose from the different ways in which they were expanded. As a theory this was rather sharply criticised by Dr. Salmon in his well-known and justly valued *Introduction to the New Testament*,¹ and I am inclined myself to think that it made the fundamental document more curt and disjointed than was necessary. I believe that the original tradition contained, not only the points common to all three Synoptics, but also those which St. Mark shares alternately with each of his companions. But however that may be, Dr. Abbott's preliminary explanations contained some brilliant specimens of critical acumen, which the student of the Synoptic problem cannot afford to neglect, especially at the present moment. Their tendency was to account for some of the variants in the three Gospels by confusion

¹ Pages 117-151.

arising out of textual corruption or ambiguities in the fundamental text, supposing that text to be Greek. A simple and attractive example was St. Mark xiv. 49 (=Matt. xxvi. 55, Luke xxii. 53), where the difference between "I was in the temple" (Mark, Luke), and "I sat (*ἐκαθεζόμενον*) in the temple" (Matt.), was explained as due to the ambiguity of *ἦμην*, "was" (which is actually found in St. Mark), and *ἤμην*, "sat" (which is paraphrased in St. Matthew), the MS. of course at this date not having any breathings. Some other explanations of apparent differences involve nothing more serious than the different supplying of an omitted subject ("He eateth," "your Master eateth," "ye eat" in Mark ii. 16 = Matt. ix. 11 = Luke v. 30), or the different dividing of clauses where in the original the sense was not helped by punctuation (Mark xiii. 9, 10 = Matt. xxiv. 14, x. 18, and possibly elsewhere).

The climax of ingenuity was reached when, in the parable of the talents or pounds, "over many things" was equated with "over ten cities" (*ἐπιπολλῶν = ἐπιπολεῶν*); and even more when, in St. Luke viii. 39, "publishing throughout the whole city" was explained as merely a variant on St. Mark v. 20 (*ἐν τῇ Δεκαπόλει = ἐν τῇ πόλει*). Conjectures like these last perhaps come under the head of those which are almost too brilliant to be true. But Dr. Abbott's examples are not only all scholarly, and all possible, but some of them reach a distinct degree of probability; and his case as a whole seems to me quite to deserve a hearing, especially at a time when much is said about variants derived from the Hebrew or Aramaic and little about variants derived from the Greek.

In this respect, to glance back once more over the pages of Dr. Abbott may help us to keep our balance when we turn to Prof. Marshall. One might say beforehand, speaking from the general point of view of Synoptic criticism,

that those explanations are most likely to hold good which in sections presumably belonging to the Petrine Memoirs assume a variant through the Greek, and in sections presumably belonging to the *Logia* assume a variant through the Hebrew or Aramaic. But this is only an *a priori* view: we must hold lightly to it, as to all the hypotheses we have to deal with. In particular, we must not make up our minds too fixedly as to what belongs to the one document and what to the other. Let us patiently weigh and test what is said on all sides, prepared to accept what is proved, but not regarding the proof as complete too prematurely.

In this task there is reason to expect that we shall receive valuable help from Prof. Marshall. I am writing as the second of his series of articles, in the February number of *THE EXPOSITOR*, has just reached me; and it is impossible not to augur well from the close and careful study to which it bears witness.¹ It seems to me that Prof. Marshall is fortunate even in his limitations. I gather that his investigations have been conducted independently of those on the Continent which run most parallel to them. This gives all the greater weight to the points of coincidence which I believe will be found to exist between them.

Mr. Marshall claims to bring forward proof (1) that many passages in our present Gospels are based upon an original document or documents written in an Aramaic dialect similar to that of the Targums; (2) that such a document was already known to St. Paul. As one of the examples adduced in support of this is taken from 1 Thessalonians v. 3, we must suppose that it was known to St. Paul throughout the whole of his career, so far as it is covered by his extant epistles: in other words, its date must be at least

¹ Since this was written the further case in the March number has been presented, and I regret to learn that Semitic scholars do not think so favourably of it as I had hoped.

earlier than the year 52 A.D. The proof in this case would perhaps be hardly stringent. There is not, I think, anything decisive to show that the words in question came down to St. Paul in writing, and not orally. But it is true that, when we descend to 1 Timothy v. 18, the words, "the labourer is worthy of his hire," are quoted expressly as "Scripture"; and Prof. Marshall appears to be prepared to maintain that St. Paul's quotations generally are taken from a written Gospel. I gather also that, although he will not press the point, he is yet inclined to identify this Gospel with the *Logia* which Papias ascribes to St. Matthew.

Here we are confronted with a view which a short time ago would have been regarded as highly paradoxical, but which is now stoutly maintained from several distinct quarters at once. Mr. Halcombe has an elaborate argument to prove, not only that Gospels, but that our present Gospels, are included in the *logoi* and *paradoseis* to which there are such frequent references. Here we may well hesitate to agree with him, but the chapter in which this is maintained¹ nevertheless deserves reading. Then we have Mr. Wright putting his Petrine Memoirs within twelve years, and his other two leading documents within twenty-four years, from the ascension—let us say, not later than the year 54 A.D. Again we may question the validity of the reasoning, but at any rate the opinion is there. And most solid of all is the imposing body of proof advanced by Dr. Resch.

Dr. Resch covers most of the ground occupied by his English supporters, and considerably more. He has the keenest eye for possible quotations from a Gospel in the epistles. He not only annexes in this sense a number of passages introduced by *γέγραπται*, *ἐγράφη*, *ἡ γραφή λέγει* (1 Cor. ii. 9, ix. 10; 1 Tim. v. 18; St. James iv. 5),

¹ *Historic Relation of the Gospels*, pp. 32-50.

or λέγει simply, with ἡ γραφή or an equivalent understood (as in Eph. v. 14). Once more, as to some in the early Church, St. Paul's κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιόν μου becomes a quotation, if not from St. Luke, yet from an evangelical document. Formulæ like πιστὸς ὁ λόγος have the same origin, and phrases like ἐν Κυρίῳ, ἐν λόγῳ Κυρίου, also point to some recorded saying. It is fair to add that in these instances he is frequently able to appeal, not merely to the formula, but also to some patristic parallel which, if not expressly set down as a saying of the Lord, might not unreasonably be considered such.

Further, Dr. Resch makes a very large use of Professor Marshall's weapon of various translation. By this means he is able to refer many anonymous quotations in the epistles to a Hebrew original, and so to increase the probability that they are taken from a Gospel. And just as Prof. Marshall fortifies himself by analogous cases from the Old Testament, so he too strengthens his position by an appeal to similar varieties of rendering in the different columns of the Hexapla. A convenient summary of instances is given from the Acts, many of St. Paul's epistles, Hebrews, St. James, and the Apocalypse; and it will be interesting to see how this list compares with Prof. Marshall's.¹

Both writers hold that the document which was quoted thus freely was the *Logia* of St. Matthew. I have little doubt that if any form of written Gospel existed at this early date, the view that it was the *Logia* is the most tenable. And I have little doubt also that if the use of it in the other books of the New Testament can be proved, Dr. Resch and Prof. Marshall between them will do as much as lies within the power of man to prove it. I hope that their arguments will receive a full and candid consideration. I desire myself to give them this, and

¹ *Agrapha*, pp. 89-92.

therefore I do not wish to speak too decidedly, although I must confess that at present my leaning is to the side of scepticism. This side is stated with his usual force by Dr. Paul Ewald.¹ He naturally dismisses the formulæ of quotation as proving nothing. If it were certain that a Gospel was in existence, then we might be justified in referring the formulæ to it; but the formulæ in themselves by no means necessarily point to a Gospel. The real quotations from "Words of the Lord" Dr. Ewald reduces to six (1 Cor. vii. 10 f., ix. 14, xi. 23 ff; 1 Thess. iv. 15 ff; Acts xx. 35, xi. 10).² And then he points to the fact that *not one* of these passages agrees verbally with anything in our Synoptic Gospels. He insists, further, on the absence of proof that the *logoi* or *paradoxeis* included anything like a written Gospel. Perhaps there is just a little more to be said for this than he allows, based especially on the prologue to St. Luke (*πολλοὶ ἐπεχείρησαν ἀνατάξασθαι διήγησιν . . . καθὼς παρέδωσαν . . . ὑπηρέται τοῦ λόγου . . . περὶ ὧν κατηχήθης λόγων*). Still if, as I believe, St. Luke did not write before the year 80 A.D., his language—press it as we may—would prove nothing as to the existence of a Gospel in the year 52.

One obstacle in the way of supposing that the *Logia* of St. Matthew existed at such an early date, though obvious enough, I do not think has been noticed. It is that the supposition conflicts, or at least appears to conflict, with the external evidence. Irenæus says expressly that St. Matthew put forth his Gospel "amongst the Hebrews in their own tongue, while Peter and Paul were preaching at Rome, and founding the Church."³ This would carry us to a date A.D. 63-67, or at the latest 68. I confess that

¹ *Hauptproblem*, etc., pp. 143-148.

² Mr. Marshall would add to these Rom. xiv. 14-21, as agreeing in substance with parts of the Sermon on the Mount, Rom. xiii. 7, and 1 Tim. v. 10 (THE EXPOSITOR for July, 1890, p. 70 f.)

³ *Ap. Euseb.*, II. E. v. 8.

such a date appears to me more probable. If not, we should have to suppose that Irenæus is thinking—as he may be himself, though it is less likely that the authority from which his statement was derived was thinking—not of the original work of St. Matthew, but of the Gospel as we have it.

Let us keep our minds open; though in weighing the case as it is presented to us by Dr. Resch or Prof. Marshall, we shall, I think, do well to remember how many possibilities there are on all sides. It does not follow that everything which is capable of being represented as a various rendering from the Hebrew is really such a variety of rendering. There is an inherent tendency in the human mind to paraphrase and the use of synonyms, which may come into play quite as possibly without any intervening of translation: one writer may use *τηρεῖν* and another *φυλάσσειν*, one *ἀδικεῖν* and another *ἀνομεῖν*, and the like, without having a Hebrew original before them. Hence, even granting that there was a Hebrew original, it would have to be proved that that original was a Gospel; and granting that there was a Gospel, it would have to be proved that it was a *written* Gospel; and granting that it was a written Gospel, it would have to be proved that it was one of those incorporated in our present Gospels, and not extra-canonical. It seems to me therefore, with all respect for the two zealous and capable scholars whose work we are considering, that they have a considerable task before them before their case can be regarded as proved.

It must be remembered however that this particular position, that a written Gospel existed before even the earliest of St. Paul's epistles which have come down to us, and that it is freely quoted in those epistles and in other books of the New Testament, is only part of what they undertake to establish. Dr. Resch and Prof. Marshall travel in company some way further. They both

agree in contending that there are traces of the same Semitic original in the Gospels themselves; that many of the varying expressions in those Gospels are due simply to differences of translation; and that when Papias speaks of the "many who translated St. Matthew's *Logia* as best they could," his words are verified by the actual diversities which meet the eye in our present Greek Testaments.

Here I, for one, am prepared to meet our two inquirers half-way. I believe antecedently that what they maintain is probable, and that it only needs the sharpened attention, the critical acumen, and the knowledge of Semitic dialects which both of them possess, to bring out the facts of which they are in search. There will doubtless not be wanting scholars competent to estimate their success, though I have previously explained that I cannot count myself among the number. They must not however be surprised if we outsiders exercise a certain wariness and caution in committing ourselves to results before they are endorsed as well by Semitic scholars as by students of the Synoptic problem. May I describe frankly what will be my own attitude of mind on the subject?

1. I do not wish to hold obstinately to any one particular theory, in case good reason should be shown for changing it. At the same time, there seems to me to be such a degree of presumption in favour of the Two-Document Hypothesis, that I should start from that, at least provisionally. But if we accept the statements of Papias, which so far as we have seen are confirmed rather than refuted by critical analysis, it is involved in the hypothesis that the first main document, the Petrine Memoirs, was originally written in Greek, and the second only, the Matthaean *Logia*, composed in the first instance in Hebrew. Assuming this, it would follow that assent could be given far more easily to the theory of a Hebrew original in those parts of the Gospels which probably

come from the *Logia* than in those which seem more likely to have belonged to the Petrine Memoirs. An example lies near at hand. Dr. Resch gives some boldly marked specimens of his reconstruction of the Hebrew text underlying the divergent Greek readings which have come down to us. The first of these is taken from St. Matthew xxv. 35, 36. These verses are quoted no less than four times in the *Clementine Homilies*, in all four cases freely and allusively; still there is so large a constant element running through the passages that, after verifying each reference, I am inclined to think that Dr. Resch is justified in his version of the text which the Clementine writer had before him. Compared with the canonical text the variants can be represented as well in English as in Greek.

ΜΑΤΤ. XXV. 35, 36.

ἐπείνασα,
καὶ ἐδώκατέ μοι φαγεῖν·
ἐδίψησα,
καὶ ἐπότισάτέ με·
ξένος ἤμην,
καὶ σπηγάγετέ με·
γυμνός,
καὶ περιβάλετέ με·
ἠσθένησα,
καὶ ἐπεσκεψασθέ με·
ἐν φυλακῇ ἤμην,
καὶ ἤλθετε πρὸς με.

I was hungry,
and ye gave Me to eat:
I was thirsty,
and ye made Me to drink:
I was a stranger,
and ye took Me in:
I was naked,
and ye clothed Me:

CLEM. HOM.

ἐπείνασα,
καὶ ἐθρέψατέ με·
ἐδίψησα,
καὶ ποτὸν παρέσχετε μοι·
ξένος ἤμην,
καὶ ἐδέξασθέ με·
γυμνός,
καὶ ἐνεδύσατέ με·
ἐνόσησα,
καὶ ἐπεσκεψασθέ με·
ἐν εἰρκτῇ ἤμην,
καὶ ἐβοηθήσατέ μοι.

I was hungry,
and ye fed Me:
I was thirsty,
and ye gave Me drink:
I was a stranger,
and ye welcomed Me:
I was naked,
and ye arrayed Me:

MATT. XXV. 35, 36.

I was *sick*,
and ye visited Me :
I was in *prison*,
and ye *came to Me*.

CLEM. HOM.

I was *ill*,
and ye visited Me :
I was in *ward*,
and ye *succoured Me*.

The structure of the two versions is the same, indeed it could hardly be different; but almost every marked expression varies, and in the Clementines the variations are repeated so often, that they are not likely to be a mere caprice of the writer. I am not competent to judge of the Hebrew translation which Dr. Resch has appended; but beforehand I should be quite prepared to hear that the verdict of Hebraists was that it was successful. The passage is taken from a chapter which very probably belonged to the *Logia*, which we believe to have been originally written in Hebrew.

In the next of his examples too Dr. Resch has a plausible case, which I can quite imagine impressing the reader at first sight, but I am by no means so clear that it really holds good. Here we have the triple synopsis, and the passage is also quoted in a very divergent manner by Clement of Alexandria.

CLEM. ALEX.
(*Pædag.* 1, 2, p. 101.)

ἀνάστα, φησὶ
τῷ παρειμένῳ,
τὸν σκίμποδα
ἐφ' ὃν κατέ-
κεισαι λαβὼν
ἄπιθι οἴκαδε.

Stand up,
saith He, to the
palsiedman; and
picking up thy
truckle-bed where-
on thou liest,
begone homewards.

LUKE V. 24.

εἶπεν τῷ πα-
ραλελιμένῳ·
ἔγειρε καὶ ἄρας
τὸ κλινίδιον σου
πορεύου εἰς τὸν
οἶκόν σου.

He said to
the paralysed:
Arise, and tak-
ing up thy
little couch, go
to thine house.

MARK II. 11.

λέγει τῷ πα-
ραλυτικῷ· ἔγειρε,
ἄρον τὸν κρά-
βαττόν σου, καὶ
ὑπάγε εἰς τὸν
οἶκόν σου.

He saith to
the paralytic:
Arise, take up
thy pallet-bed,
and depart to
thine house.

MATT. IX. 6.

λέγει τῷ πα-
ραλυτικῷ· ἔγειρε,
ἄρόν σου τὴν
κλίνην, καὶ
ὑπάγε εἰς τὸν
οἶκόν σου.

He saith to
the paralytic;
Arise, take up
thy couch, and
depart to thine
house.

The last two columns, St. Matthew and St. Mark, agree closely together, and it is allowed that they represent the same version; but St. Luke differs in several slighter points, and Clement of Alexandria almost as much as it is possible to differ. I do not however attach any importance to this. I believe that Clement is simply paraphrasing the whole passage, as one very often does in a sermon, for the sake of greater freshness modernizing the familiar words, and using one's own natural style of narrative. I believe that Clement has done this, and that there is no ground for saying that he made use of another version of a Hebrew original. A line or two lower down, he quotes from St. John, "Lazarus, come forth"; yet the Greek for "come forth" (*ἐξιθι*) is quite different from that of our Gospel (*δεῦρο ἔξω*), and no one would say that St. John wrote in Hebrew. It will be observed that *ἐξιθι* in this quotation corresponds to *ἄπιθι οἴκαδε* in the preceding, and shows that forms of this kind were running in his mind.

Neither can I attach much more weight to the variants in St. Luke. They none of them go beyond those slight verbal changes which the evangelist elsewhere allows himself. He avoids the form *παραλυτικός*, which does not occur at all in his Gospel, though it occurs five times each in St. Matthew and St. Mark. *κλινίδιον*, as compared with *κλίνην* in St. Matthew, is a mere literary variation. And *ὑπάγειν* is another word of which St. Luke is not very fond. It occurs only five times in the corrected text of his Gospel, against fifteen times in the shorter Gospel of St. Mark, and twenty times in St. Matthew. On the other hand, *πορεύεσθαι* is found only three times in St. Mark, and those three all in the disputed verses at the end of the Gospel, and no less than fifty times in St. Luke.

Lastly, the fact that St. Matthew and St. Mark are so clearly based upon a common Greek original naturally

raises a presumption against the use of an altogether different original by St. Luke.

I am aware that Dr. B. Weiss sees in this section of the paralytic a mingling of the *Logia* with the Petrine Memoirs, and that is a point which I do not wish to prejudge: it is possible that the coincidence between the *κλινίδιον* of St. Luke and *κλίνην* of St. Matthew, as against St. Mark's characteristic *κράβαττον*, may not be altogether accidental: still I greatly doubt if any important influence on this passage is due to divergent rendering from the Hebrew.

2. A second caution that I should be disposed to observe has just been indicated. When two variant expressions are put before me as due to divergent rendering from the Hebrew, I should ask if they are equally explicable as differences of style. Mr. Marshall writes in the February EXPOSITOR,¹ "If one evangelist says *πορεύου εἰς εἰρήνην*, while the other says *ὑπάγε εἰς εἰρήνην*; if one says *ἀνέστη*, and another *ἠγέρθη*, our attention is aroused." He adds, very rightly, that "we shall not feel secure to build on such superficial cases." I would go further, and say that there was not even a *prima facie* case for any thought of a Hebrew original in the examples quoted. We have just seen that *πορεύεσθαι* does not occur at all in the body of St. Mark's Gospel, whereas it is a favourite expression in St. Luke. Now considering how closely St. Mark represents the Petrine Memoirs, and considering how far more probable it is that those Memoirs were originally in Greek, and that the greater part of them was used equally by St. Luke, the variation cannot in many instances at least be due to anything but idiosyncrasy of style. The same holds good for the other example given: *ἀναστῆναι* occurs twice, or possibly three times, in St. Matthew, to fifteen times in St. Mark, and twenty-four times in St. Luke. It is clear that the word must have

¹ Page 123.

been avoided by the first evangelist, even where it stood before him.

3. Yet one more caution. The critic must be on the watch for variants which have arisen, not from any fundamental Hebrew, but simply in the course of transmission of the Greek text. I do not absolutely say that in some of these cases traces may not be preserved of an older form of text. The subject is a highly interesting one, and I do not think that we have as yet got quite to the bottom of it. I should myself be only too glad to rescue all that can be rescued from the footnotes of a critical Greek Testament as genuine and, as Dr. Resch calls it, "pre-canonical" material.¹ My impression is however that he has gone too far in this direction. He claims especially, as satisfying the required conditions, many of the variants of the so called "Western Text," headed by Codex Bezae (D); and no doubt there are some of the variants in this text (as notably the incident of the man working on the Sabbath) which have a strong ring of genuineness. Let it be remembered that there are four possibilities: (1) that these readings, as Dr. Resch thinks, really belong to an older stage in the history of our present Gospels; (2) that they are derived from oral tradition; (3) that they are derived from some other written source, not pre- but extra-canonical; (4) that they are simple corruptions of the canonical text. Each of these possibilities ought to be fully weighed before a decision is given; or rather, it is not only single readings that should be weighed, but whole groups of readings. In the verse (Matt. xi. 27), "No man knoweth the Son, but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal Him," there are, besides others, two considerable variants which

¹ I am not sure that I am right in supposing that Dr. Resch treats "pre-canonical" and "genuine" as equivalent terms. Some of the readings which he quotes from St. John on p. 23 f. cannot be genuine.

have a large amount of extremely early support: (i.) the order of the two principal clauses ("no man . . . Father," "neither . . . Son") is inverted quite fully and deliberately by the following authorities quoting the whole verse: Justin Martyr three times, *Clementine Homilies* four times, Marcion, the Marcosians as quoted by Irenæus twice, Irenæus himself twice (though not in two other places), Epiphanius three times, quoting the whole verse, and six times besides omitting the last clause, though four times also with the other reading, as well as by a cloud of other authorities, quoting the two first clauses only; (ii.) the aorist ἔγνω for the presents ἐπιγινώσκει (Matt.) or γινώσκει (Luke) is found in Justin Martyr twice out of three times, in the *Clementine Homilies* five times, in the Marcosians (*ap. Irenæum*), in Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria six times out of eight, Origen eleven times,¹ etc. Decisive authorities we should say for both readings, if we looked only at their diffusion and at their date: and yet all these early authorities which transpose the clauses really stand self-condemned, because the last clause, "and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal Him," clearly requires that "the Son" shall have been the subject of the clause immediately preceding. And even as regards the aorist ἔγνω, we are warned not to attach too much weight to the patristic quotations, however numerous and however early, by the parallel case of St. John i. 13, where it is extremely probable that, not only the commonly quoted authorities, Irenæus three times, Tertullian twice, Ambrose and Augustine once each (though not in other places), but also, as Resch has proved, Justin Martyr in no less than five clear allusions, read ἐγεννήθη (for ἐγεννήθησαν, referring the words to Christ), which is certainly wrong.

I have mentioned some of the cautions which I should

¹ I have used besides Tischendorf the careful discussion of these readings in Bousset, *Evangelienicitate Justini*, p. 100 f., which I have partially verified.

myself use in approaching the deeply interesting theories of Prof. Marshall and Dr. Resch. I do not wish to express a more definite opinion about them at present—not because I think that it will really be difficult to form one, but because I do not think it either fair to them, or a sound process in itself, to hazard any sweeping general opinion after the hasty and partial study which I have as yet been able to give to them. In a case of cumulative evidence like this, a number of particular arguments may fall through, and yet enough may be left standing to bear the conclusion: it is only right to take the soundest arguments, and view them, not singly, but together.¹

W. SANDAY.

THE DESCENT OF CHRIST INTO HADES.

A CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN PROFESSOR FRANZ
DELITZSCH AND PROFESSOR VON HOFMANN.

DELITZSCH TO HOFMANN (*cont. of letter*).

PERMIT me briefly to return to Ephesians iv. 8-10. As the Hebrew קַוְוֹתֵי תַיִת הָאָרְצָה is used without exception to designate the inward parts of the earth and the lower world, τὰ κατώτερα τῆς γῆς and the fuller τὰ κατώτερα μέρη τῆς γῆς can only mean the lower regions of earth, considered as lying beneath the upper world, and, like ἄδης or ἄβυσσος in other passages, it is the polaric opposite to οὐρανός; instead of which word the apostle, wishing to choose the most absolute expression for the highest, as he has already done for the lowest point, uses the phrase ὑπεράνω πάντων τῶν οὐρανῶν. You will answer, that the connexion requires us to understand τὰ κατώτερα in the sense of the earth con-

¹ I have not found myself able to conclude the subject in the four papers originally planned; there is still one more to follow, dealing chiefly with Dr. Resch.

sidered as lower than heaven ; but, my dear friend, when the meaning of an expression is as firmly fixed as the stamp on a coin, the connexion must be fitted in with the meaning, and not the meaning with the connexion. The apostle's quotation of Psalm lxviii. 19 throws light, to my mind, on the connexion between his statement that Christ descended *ad inferos* and the ἡχμαλώτευσεν αἰχμαλωσίαν. Αἰχμαλωτεύειν in your opinion (ii. 482) can mean nothing else than the taking captive of conquered enemies ; and what connexion could there be between that supposed action of the descended Saviour and the distribution of the gifts of grace by the exalted Christ? Hölemann, in the second part of his *Bibelstudien*, has answered this question rightly ; he says that ἡχμαλώτευσεν and ἔδωκε δόματα τοῖς ἀνθρώποις stand related to each other in the sense of the victorious triumph and the largess of blessing. The gifts which the exalted Saviour distributes (and we must understand them to be not first of all persons and offices, ver. 11, but rather graces) make their influence felt even upon the world of lost spirits (1 Cor. xii. 10 ; Mark xvi. 7). The sending of the Spirit and the bestowal of gifts by the exalted Christ follow and depend upon His victory over the prince of death, and over the whole realm of demons that inhabit the abyss, Abaddon and his army of locusts (in which you see a picture of the destructive forces of the nether world, i. 358) ; *i.e.* on the assumption of His victory over Hades and His triumph as proclaimed in Colossians ii. 15 (a passage which in my opinion is relevant here). The gifts which He bestows are the trophies of His victory. And my view—that those who have received of His gifts, and whose duty it is to exercise them in the pastoral office, are required to regard these gifts as coming to them from the risen and victorious Lord, and to look upon themselves as gifts meant for the service of the community,—involves an exhortation to humility and peace-seeking, no

less pressing than that which follows from your interpretation, that Christ first descended into the lowliness of our earthly life, and thus only ascended far above all heavens.

Allow me to add two tiny sheets to these two long ones, so that my letter may be like a four-leaved clover. We have digressed to the question of our state in death. This question is closely connected with that of the state of our Lord in death; it is, besides, of great importance in itself, and much of your teaching on the subject is not clear to me. In iii. 482 you briefly but decidedly pronounce against the theory of a sleep of the soul. "The disembodied state of the soul does not imply that it is turned in upon itself and lacks an outward expression of its life."

But what I ventured to say was, not that you inclined to the view of a soul-sleep, but only that you seemed to favour a view which somewhat resembled it; and, to speak frankly, I had in my mind this passage in your work (ii. 490), which is retained in the second edition: "The soul of the man who dies in faith is in a state that corresponds to the state of his dead body, which returns to dust, and is yet awaiting its resurrection." This passage can hardly be read without a shudder. It expresses, on the one hand, more and, on the other, less than you desire to say. More—for you surely do not mean that the corruption of the body has an analogy as regards the soul? Less—for it represents the state of the soul as analogous to the state of the body in death, and not as itself an actual state of death; whereas you draw from Revelation xx. 4 the conclusion that the departed souls, even of believers, are in a real state of death.

In my judgment it is simply impossible that the subject of *ἐξῆσαν* in that passage (they became alive again) should be *ψυχαί*, and not rather *πεπλεκισμένοι*. You yourself

teach that the life which is acquired through the new birth outlasts that which begins at natural birth (iii. 482, etc.). You will probably grant, further, that this life, when once we are set free from the body of death, does not only last on, but finds itself unburdened and untrammelled, and so bursts forth into greater intensity. You will grant that when the earthly vessel is broken, not only is the inward, spiritual life of the soul revealed, but that "the light of the living" in which it now dwells, meets it in its inward power, so that the soul is within the region of the ζὴ ἀιώνιος, both as regards its personal life and as regards the home life upon which it has entered. How then could it be said, that it is in a state of death? Not of the soul or the spirit may we say that they are dead, but only of the person in his bodily aspect, and as it were *per zeugma*. You yourself say (iii. 482): The departed one is with Christ as a disembodied *ego*, and his body is in the kingdom of death. Instead of "disembodied *ego*," I should prefer to say, "his spirit or his soul." For these are the words of Scripture. The *ego* is substantially nothing. It is *merus actus*.

In another aspect besides, your view of the state of the faithful departed in death is not clear to me. You teach (iii. 482, etc.) that Scripture indicates and describes their life as being one of heavenly communion with Christ, and not as having any relation with the world. I agree with you on this point, but ask one question: Does Scripture define and describe that life as being one of heavenly communion with the Lord alone, and not as also having communion with the angels and the other saints?

In closing, I make one general observation. It is perfectly inadmissible, you say (ii. 482), to understand the apostle's language in Ephesians iv. 8-10 as implying that

the words ἡχμαλώτευσεν αἰχμαλωσίαν, which he quotes from the Psalms, meant for him a redemption of those who were bound in Hades. In a note you remark: "This is the view of König and of Delitzsch in the *System der biblischen Psychologie*, p. 357." My words there are: "Coming forth from Hades, rising from the grave and ascending into heaven, the Lord led captivity captive (Eph. iv. 8), He triumphed over the angelic powers (Col. ii. 15), and bore with Him to heaven those human beings who in Hades had worshipped Him as Redeemer," etc. Do these words prove that I understand the leading captivity captive to refer directly to the liberation of captives? Not so, but only indirectly; because, when Christ conquered the powers of Hades and led them captive, He also set free the souls which they had held in bondage. Your quotation from my book is therefore inapposite.

It is utter folly, you say (iii. 484), to take the fact that the souls wear garments as a proof that they have a corporeal form. In a note you quote Hebart's book on the second visible coming of Christ (p. 234). But Hebart only makes the very prudent observation, "The white garments point to a corporeal form." Is it not quite true, that the garment white as the light takes the place in the intermediate state of the glorified body which is yet awaiting? The reproach of folly is severe, and falls on me also; but let us have done with over-sensitiveness. We are seeking truth, not honour.

These are only examples selected at random. Speaking generally, I find that you, as a theologian with a system of your own, have much difficulty in looking at ideas and chains of thought from the point of view of others. Your strength has thus a certain weakness corresponding to it; and this weakness easily changes into unfairness, because you place your opponent's view from the first in an unfavourable position, instead of looking at it in the most

favourable light, and then proceeding to prove that it is inadmissible.

I have nothing but praise for the conscientious faithfulness with which you make use of all previous writings. As far as I am concerned, I am glad to think that my work has not been proudly ignored. On the contrary, it is clear from beginning to end of your book that you have kindly and thoroughly examined it, and I owe to you a thousand impulses to new lines of thought. With this word of gratitude I send you my four-leaved letter, hoping that you will reply with one of equal length.

HOFMANN TO DELITZSCH.

THE long and important letter in which you appeal to me to examine more thoroughly the full bearings of the question of the "descent into Hades" has made me so ashamed of the timidity which led me to despair of our ever coming to an agreement on this subject, that I feel I can only atone for my fault (which I ought to have avoided all the more carefully, since I am increasingly anxious to interpret these words of the Apostles' Creed in no sense which is out of harmony, or only in partial harmony, with Scripture and the Church of Christ) by a thoroughgoing discussion of all those points which you commend to my consideration.

You, dearest friend, began with the general and passed on to the particular: permit me to take the opposite course, and to express my views in detail on the two passages of the New Testament which it is of primary importance for us to understand. If we could come to an agreement on them, the rest of our discussion would be greatly simplified.

I begin with Ephesians iv. 8-10. As the words *κατέβη εἰς τὰ κατώτερα μέρη τῆς γῆς*—for this is in my opinion the correct reading—understood as meaning the same as

יָרַד לְחַהֲתִיּוֹת הָאָרֶץ, contain nothing upon which I need to alter my opinion, we have only to consider the words (quoted from the sixty-eighth Psalm) ἡχμαλώτευσεν αἰχμαλωσίαν, which you understand as referring to a victory of Christ over the demons. This application of these doubtful words could hardly have been founded on the context of the psalm itself. Are not the three parallel clauses, עֲלִיתָ לְפָרוֹם, לְקַחַת כְּתָנוֹת בְּאָדָם וְאֶף סוּרְרִים, and שְׁבִית שְׁבִי, in connexion with לְשֹׁכֵן יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים? Jehovah's victory, leading captive, and bestowal of gifts, had all one object—that He might make His dwelling-place in Zion. The prisoners whom He led captive with this purpose in view must surely be the rebels from whom He took those things which they gave to Him as their conqueror. Besides, I cannot understand why the apostle should have placed the two clauses, ἡχμαλώτευσεν αἰχμαλωσίαν and ἔδωκεν δόματα τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, in an entirely different (according to Hölemann's interpretation, in a contrary) relationship. Those whom Christ has made His prisoners, and those to whom He has given gifts, appear to me to be the same.

Αἰχμαλωτεύειν is used in the same sense as *αἰχμαλωτίζειν* in 2 Timothy iii. 6 or 2 Corinthians x. 5; and when St. Paul calls a fellow Christian his *συναιχμάλωτος*, as he does in Romans xvi. 7, Colossians iv. 10, Philemon 23, I gather from the first of these passages, in which he does not write as a literal prisoner, that he is describing his fellow Christian as one whose hostility to the gospel Christ has overcome, as He had done in the case of St. Paul himself. The words quoted from the psalm, taken in connexion with the passage into which the apostle has incorporated them, mean this: Christ has given to those who possess a *χάρις* or *χάρισμα* that which fits them for and gives them in their measure a share in the building up of the body of Christ; they were naturally and in former times enemies, whom He has overcome and fitted for His service. This is one point

which the apostle presents for our consideration. The other concerns the events which preceded all this in the life of Christ, the work He did in order to bring it about. The *ἀνέβη* has for its necessary condition that he *κατέβη*, namely, *εἰς τὰ κατώτερα μέρη τῆς γῆς*. Of this last expression, dearest friend, you say that its meaning is as fixed as the stamp on a coin. Is it really so? Can we say positively that the comparative does not hinder us from regarding it as of similar meaning to *τὰ ὑποκάτω τῆς γῆς*, *τὰ ὑποχθόνια* Ἰσραὴλ, *תַּחְתִּיתוֹ*, although the last expression is never so translated? In the psalm these words, understood in this sense, would not fit in with the context, while we read there also of a *καταβαίνειν* of Jehovah, which preceded his *ἀναβαίνειν*. For He who *הָרַג בְּשִׁמִּי שְׂמִי־קָדָם* is said to have become a *בְּעֶרְכּוֹת דָּגָב*, and to have gone before His people *בְּיָשִׁימוֹן*. It was thus that He became the ruler who made Zion the seat of His power, and of His glory over all the kingdoms of the earth. Translated into the language of the New Testament, is not this exactly what we read in Philippians ii. 6 of Jesus Christ? The *עֲבָנִי* did not appear as such, but, as we shall be singing in these Christmas days, “He became a little child.” The words which David uses of himself in Psalm cxxxix. 15, *רַקְמִתִּי בְּתַחְתִּיּוֹת אָרֶץ*, were true of Christ.

When He appears the second time, He shall come *μετὰ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ*. He shall shine like lightning from one end of heaven to the other. His first coming, on the other hand, was a *καταβαίνειν εἰς τὰ κατώτερα μέρη τῆς γῆς*. He did not appear above the earth, compelling the recognition of His glory, but upon it. He did not come down from the visible heaven, *ἐν τοῖς ἀνωτέροις μέρεσιν τῆς γῆς*, but He came to our abode, *ἐν τοῖς κατωτέροις*. For we might take the antithesis in this way, without making *τῆς γῆς* an epexegetic genitive. The idea of the passage is essentially the same as that of our Lord in Matthew xx. 28, when He shows why he who will be great among His

disciples must be the servant of others. We are taught how to look upon the differences in *χάρις* in the sense of a particular vocation which are found among Christians. All this would disappear if the apostle were writing of a triumphant *καταβαίνειν* of Christ, a *καταβαίνειν* which would be rather the beginning of His *ἀναβαίνειν*. It does not disappear if the words mean simply what a descent into the lower world would naturally mean to men. According to the former view, there would be a reaching on to the final result of our Lord's descent from heaven, a result which is so closely connected with His death, that it hardly requires to be named apart from it, while, according to the latter, the great contrast of *καταβαίνειν* and *ἀναβαίνειν* remains the same as in John vi. 38, 62, or Romans x. 6, 7.

But what are we to say of 1 Peter iii. 19? The fact that we are agreed on ver. 18 gives me courage to discuss the passage again with you. For any interpretation of *ζωοποιηθείς πνεύματι* which would make these words refer to an event *not* connected with the resurrection of Christ, cuts the ground from under my feet. The question between us is thus simply this, Is the subject of *ἐκήρυξεν* Christ as *ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ ὑπάρχων*, or as the Son of man who had suffered death? The words *ἐν πνεύματι*, which explain more nearly how the *κηρύσσειν* was effected, are in my view opposed to the latter interpretation. If the reference were to an event in our Lord's life in the flesh, the event would be set before us as one which did not belong to His life, as it was affected by His possession of an earthly body, but as occurring at a time when this condition yielded to the life in the spirit.

He who lives *ἐν σαρκί* may perform an action *ἐν πνεύματι*, which, because this contrast of *σάρξ* and *πνεῦμα* exists in him, may be said to have been done *ἐν πνεύματι*. But is this possible to one who is in a state of death? I think not, because it cannot be said of him, that he does anything *ἐν σαρκί* or *ἐν σώματι*. As *νεκρός* he can do nothing at all;

as πνεύμα he cannot do anything ἐν πνεύματι, because this would imply that he could also do something ἐν σώματι or ἐν σαρκί. Neither could the expression be used of Christ when He had for the second time a bodily existence, for ἐν πνευματικῷ σώματι the above-mentioned contrast exists no longer. On the other hand, the words might be applied to Him, as ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ ὑπάρχων πρὸς τὸν Θεόν in heaven, or as sitting at the right hand of God on high, in His glorified human body. For in the one case, as in the other, all that He does or did in relation to the world is, or was, done by means of the Spirit; it was His Πνεύμα which ruled in the prophets. And I therefore think that the words ἐν ᾧ are of themselves sufficient to transfer the κηρύσσειν τοῖς ἐν φυλακῇ πνεύμασιν to the time before He became incarnate. Or am I wrong in this idea?

You say, that unless the apostle made use of language to conceal rather than to reveal his thoughts, he must have meant that Christ went to the place of those who are called τὰ ἐν φυλακῇ πνεύματα, and preached to them there in that very spot. Certainly! But that is not the point; the question to be decided is whether He went and preached to them when they were πνεύματα and ἐν φυλακῇ; and I appeal to 1 Peter iv. 6 as confirmation of my view that the context goes to prove the contrary. It does so by a definite statement of circumstances which attended this preaching on the part of Christ. Or does this statement refer only to the disobedience of those to whom He preached? You admit that the words ἐκήρυξεν ἀπειθήσασιν might indicate two events happening at one and the same point of time, and in discussing the matter with you it is needless for me to appeal to Hebrews ii. 10; for in reference to that passage I now agree with you that the bringing many sons to glory, and the making the Captain of their salvation perfect through suffering, are simultaneous events.

But you tell me that the word πότε is opposed to my

view, which would require τότε. I admit now (for our recent conversation has led me to examine the passage afresh), that ποτέ belongs to απειθήσασιν, not to ἐκήρυξεν ἀπειθήσασιν, in which case it would come after ἐκήρυξεν. I therefore translate, not as formerly, "He preached, but they did not obey," but, "He preached to them when once (*i.e.* in a past which is now more definitely defined) they were disobedient." The case is the same as in Hebrews ii. 10. If we are there obliged to translate, "When He brought many sons to glory, He could do it only by making the Captain of their salvation perfect through suffering," then the present passage must mean, that when they, the spirits in prison, were in past days disobedient, it was Christ who preached to them. Why should the sentence require τότε instead of πότε before ὄτε? The important point is not *when* they were disobedient, but only that their disobedience, which belonged to the past, *i.e.* to a time preceding their imprisonment, was a disobedience against the preaching of Christ. For it is the object of the apostle, by reminding his readers of the preaching of Christ, of the manner in which it took place, the success which it had, and the state of those who rejected it, to make a fact of the immediate present—the fact, namely, that the ascended Christ finds no better reception for His preaching in the minds of many men—comprehensible and free from difficulty to the Christians of whom these men spoke evil. In this connexion πότε appears to me exactly right, while τότε would be required, I think, if we translated "after they had been disobedient." For in this case their former disobedience would be the reason why Christ preached to them now, when He who had died came to them, the dead. I cannot think it other than impossible (because opposed to all the teaching of Scripture) that their disobedience in this life should without further explanation stand as a reason for their receiving Christ's preaching in

death. We should then have to conclude that the preaching had no other object than to condemn them ; and this, as it seems to me, is utter nonsense, since their disobedience in this life had condemned them already. Besides, although there are instances of preaching addressed to individuals or to masses, perhaps even to an entire people, the only object of which was to harden, there is no case in which any other result than hardening is from the first excluded. If this is not the meaning, then some special circumstances under which the disobedience took place can alone explain why that disobedience was a reason for our Lord's preaching to those who in their lifetime had been disobedient to the word of God ; and the point to consider is therefore, *when* the disobedience took place, and what connexion it had with Him.

If you, dear friend, were able to agree with me as far as we have gone, you would perhaps set less importance on your further scruples in regard to my interpretation of this doubtful passage. You would not think it strange if it were said that Christ called Isaiah, or that He spoke to Moses. But, you say, it would be singular that He should be the subject of a preaching which had no connexion whatever with the salvation of Jehovah, which was still in the future. Has it no connexion ? Is not its burden the coming of Jehovah to judgment, and the way by which this judgment may be escaped ? Does it not in this resemble the preaching of all the prophets down to Malachi ? Yes, even of John the Baptist (Matt. iii. 12) with regard to the day of the Lord.

Jesus Himself was the first to say that He had not come to judge the world ; but He will return to judge it, and to deliver His own from the world, and so from the judgment that shall fall upon it.

Further, you notice the absence of all mention of a human medium for such preaching on the part of Christ.

But (setting aside the fact that the context leads us to infer such a medium), it was the purpose of the apostle to set forth this preaching as having been proclaimed through the instrumentality of spirit, in contrast to the bodily self-manifestation of Christ. The *ἐκήρυξεν* of this passage resembles the *εὐηγγελίσαστο* of Ephesians ii. 17 in this, that in both cases the mention of human instrumentality is avoided, and for very similar reasons. In the latter passage, the thanks for the message of salvation which had been granted to the heathen are to be ascribed to Christ Himself, since He first proclaimed the message after His resurrection (Acts xxvi. 23); and in the passage before us, the point for consideration is, that Christ was willing, before His incarnation, even as now, to speak to those who remained disobedient to His words. Nor, finally, can it be said that in my interpretation the evident contrast between the one and the other *πορευθείς* disappears; it only takes a different meaning. The going of Christ in spirit to these men, when He was with God, and His going to God in heaven after He had risen again to the life of the glorified body, are contrasted with each other, because the risen One, who is to believers the exalted Son of man, in order that they may have confidence that their sins are forgiven, comes to them in the spirit, even as in old times, and speaks to them; and, as in these days, He is afterwards as judge to show Himself in bodily presence before the eyes of the living and the dead. I for my part consider that, if we accept this explanation, the New Testament *νεκροῖς εὐηγγελίσθη* (iv. 6), with which the line of thought that begins in iii. 13 closes, corresponds to the Old Testament *τοῖς ἐν φυλακῇ πνεύμασιν ἐκήρυξεν*; while for those who understand the former words as referring to the preaching of salvation which had been heard in their lifetime by those who were dead at the time of the second coming of Christ, there can be not only no connexion whatever between two such similar passages, but even a

striking want of connexion, since in the one case it is the dead considered as dead, and in the other the dead in their lifetime who hear the word of God.

How shall I go on? You, dear friend, are, as you say, absolutely certain, that an unprejudiced expositor must necessarily understand this doubtful passage as referring to a self-manifestation of Himself by Christ in Hades in the intermediate state before His resurrection. But I can honestly say that as a result of our conversations on the descent into Hades, I have candidly examined the passage afresh with the most earnest humility towards the word of God, and with the firm resolve to let all other scruples, even those most closely connected with the doctrines we believe, give way to the plain meaning of Scripture; and yet I have not been able to come to any other conclusion than that which I have laid before you. If my exposition makes no impression on you, if you continue as certain as ever of your own view, then you make this passage teach that which is taught nowhere else, and which I cannot find in any other part of Scripture. How then are we to agree? I on my side can content myself with the reflection, that this passage bears a very important meaning, but not one which stands opposed to the analogy either of Scripture or of the faith. I do not see how you, with your interpretation, can be so easily content. You say, that the reference is to those who died before Christ, who should be led to repentance and faith, so far as they were capable of receiving salvation, by the self-manifestation of Christ in Hades. But Peter would thus represent their disobedience to the word, work, and will of God as the very reason why Christ preached to them after their death. There could not possibly be a sharper contrast with 2 Corinthians v. 10.

THE ARAMAIC GOSPEL.

DR. RESCH'S PROOFS OF TRANSLATION.

IN the February number of THE EXPOSITOR, Dr. Sanday, in commenting with characteristic kindness upon a paper which I contributed last July, and in comparing this with some works that have quite recently been published in Germany, remarked that I hardly appeared conscious of the many points of contact which my argument had with these—more particularly with the elaborate and learned work of Dr. Resch. This was purely an *argumentum e silentio*; but for once this mode of reasoning was correctly applied. When it is known, however, that the paper to which Dr. Sanday refers was penned at least twelve months before these works appeared, the silence on that occasion will readily be explained and condoned. Perhaps I ought not to expect the same condonation, when I confess that I am indebted to Dr. Sanday for first directing my attention to the *Agrapha* of Dr. Resch, as having an important bearing on our investigations. After a diligent perusal of this most erudite treatise, which is written to collect and expound all the utterances of our Lord not recorded in the Gospels, I am strangely impressed by the many points of coincidence between two of the introductory chapters and the theories which, in absolute isolation, I had been led to form. Singularly enough, this is also the most suitable place at which reference can be made to Dr. Resch, and a comparison instituted between our methods, as well as our results. We both believe in a primitive Semitic document, written by the Apostle Matthew, that this document was used by the three synoptists, and that its contents can now be recovered only by internal criticism; but Dr. Resch maintains that this primitive Gospel was written in Hebrew—not Aramaic.

In the interests of truth, it seems eminently desirable that the investigations of Dr. Resch should be placed before English scholars, so that they may be in a position to adjudicate between the rival claims of Hebrew and Aramaic to be the language in which the earliest Gospel was written. Especially is it important to ascertain the *method* by which the solution of this intricate problem has been attempted, and what kind of evidence has been deemed sufficient to satisfy one of Germany's ripest scholars as *proof* that our Greek evangelists have in some cases translated from a common Semitic document. On seeking an answer to these questions, we find that the test of translation-work, on which alone Dr. Resch relies, is the one which engaged our attention last month; and it is on this account that an examination of his researches can at this point be most opportunely undertaken. The only implement of internal criticism by which Dr. Resch proposes to prove the existence of a Hebrew Gospel embedded in our present Greek Gospels is the one which we have designated (p. 118) indication No. V.; *viz.* that the divergent Greek words are diverse renderings of one and the same Hebrew word. Our author claims *fifty-nine* cases in point. About twenty of these however do not refer to divergences in the synoptists themselves, but to the variations with which one or other of the Gospels is quoted in the sub-apostolic age—which variations are thought to imply translation from a Hebrew original. These will furnish us a fruitful field of inquiry shortly; but for the present we will omit them from the list. The remainder, with the exception of some few duplicates, we now transcribe.

	MATTHEW.	MARK.	LUKE.
	xxviii. 1.	xvi. 9.	
1	מִיָּא μῖα	πρώτη	
	viii. 19; xxii. 35.		ix. 57; x. 25.
3	מִיָּס εἷς		τις

	MATTHEW.	MARK.	LUKE.
8	כבד xxiii. 4. βαρύς		xi. 46. δυσβόστακτος
9	קשקש xxv. 24. σκληρός		xix. 21. ἀσθηρός
14	קשקש xxiv. 28. πτῶμα		xvii. 37. σῶμα
16	קשקש xxvi. 26. εὐλογεῖν	xiv. 22. εὐλογεῖν	xxii. 19. εὐχαριστεῖν
20	קשקש v. 11. εἰπεῖν πᾶν πονηρόν	(Hermas) βλασφημεῖν	vi. 22. ἐκβάλλειν τὸ ὄνομα ὡς πονηρόν
21	כוב v. 29. συμφέρι	ix. 43. καλόν ἐστιν	(Clem. Alex.) αἰρετώτερον
23	קשקש xv. 6. ἐντολή	vii. 13. λόγος	(Eriphanus) νόμος
25	קשקש viii. 2. προσκυνεῖν	i. 40. γονυπετεῖν	v. 12. πίπτειν
27	כיות ix. 18. τελευτᾶν	v. 23. ἐσχάτως ἔχειν	viii. 42. ἀποθνήσκειν
28	קשקש x. 38. λαμβάνειν	viii. 34. αἶρειν	xiv. 27. βαστάζειν
29	קשקש xvi. 25. σώζειν	viii. 35. σώζειν	xvii. 33. ζωογονεῖν
31	קשקש xii. 39. ἐπιζητεῖν	(Eriphanus) αἰτεῖν	περιποιεῖσθαι xi. 29. ζητεῖν
33	קשקש xxiii. 35. φονεῖν	(Eriphanus) ἀποκτείνειν	xi. 51. ἀπολλῆναι
36	קשקש xxvii. 26. φραγελλοῦν	xv. 15. φραγελλοῦν	xxiii. 16. παιδεύειν
39	קשקש iv. 11. ἀφιέναι	(Hom. Clemt.) παύεσθαι	iv. 13. ἀποστηῆναι
40	קשקש ix. 8. φοβεῖσθαι	ii. 12. ἐξίστασθαι	v. 26. πλησθῆναι φόβου
43	קשקש xvii. 2. μεταμορφοῦσθαι	ix. 2. μεταμορφοῦσθαι	ix. 29. ἕτερον γίνεσθαι
44	קשקש ix. 18. προσκυνεῖν	v. 22. (προσ)πίπτειν	D ἀλλοιοῦσθαι viii. 41. πίπτειν παρὰ τοὺς πόδας

	ΜΑΤΘΑΙΩΣ.	ΜΑΡΚ.	ΛΥΚΕ.
45	הַאִיר xxiv. 27. φαίνεσθαι D φαίνειν		ΛΥΚΕ. xvii. 24. λάμπειν D ἀστράπτειν
48	הַקָּה עַל־הַקָּהּ xxvi. 67. ῥαπίζειν	xiv. 65. ῥαπίσμασιν βάλλειν	xxii. 64. τύπτειν τὸ πρόσωπον
50	אִישׁ רָאוּ xvii. 9. ὄραμα	ix. 9. ἀ εἶδον	ix. 36. ὦν ἑώρακαν D ἐθεάσαντο (Eusebius)
51	אִוְלָם xxvi. 71. πυλών	xiv. 68. προαύλιον D. προσαυλή (Clem. Alex.)	πρόαυλις vi. 36.
55	הִיא כְּאִשׁוֹר v. 48. ἕσεσθαι ὡς (Eriphanus)	μιμῆσθαι iii. 16.	γίνεσθαι καθὼς vi. 14.
56	קָרָא xviii. 6. ἐπικαλεῖν	ἐπιτιθένα ὄρομα ix. 42.	ὀνομάζειν xvii. 2.
58	טוֹב συμφέρει (Ephr. Syr.) κρείσσιον	καλόν ἐστιν (Clem. Alex.) αἰρετώτερον	λυσυτελεῖ

This is the list of variant translations, which, in the judgment of this able representative of "severely critical" German scholarship, is adequate to prove the existence of a Semitic *Urevangelium*; and upon this list we would now offer a few observations.

a. It will be observed that Dr. Resch presents to us but *one kind* of proof. Simple as the thing may seem, it does not appear to have occurred to any previous investigator in this field, that the indications of translation must be of diverse kinds—just as diverse as those which occur in the several translations of the Hebrew Old Testament; and that when we are searching for indications that two or three Greek documents are translations from a hypothetical Semitic text, we ought to be able to show that the same phenomena are present as are found in works that are known to be translations from a Semitic original. Let Dr. Resch adduce instances in which the diverse vocalization

of the same Hebrew consonants, or the change of one letter, or the omission of a letter, or the transposition of two letters in the Hebrew text, will produce the divergent Greek readings which occur in the synoptists, and we will listen most attentively.

β. In the above list there are several parallel phrases that are pure synonyms. We have more than once affirmed that we could not venture to build on cases of this nature, inasmuch as the occurrence of phrases *exactly* equivalent is just what one would expect in the narrative of three witnesses who were totally independent of each other, and had no access to a common source. For instance, if, when describing (see no. 40) the strange emotions which came over the crowd when they saw the paralytic rise from his bed and carry it forth, one evangelist says, "they were all afraid," ἐφοβήθησαν; another, "they were amazed," ἐξίστασθαι; and a third, "they were filled with fear," ἐπλήσθησαν φόβου, there are two ways in which such synonymity might be explained. It might, of course, arise from the diverse rendering of a common Semitic word in a written Gospel; but if other facts were favourable, it *might* prove the very opposite, and might be used as indicating that the narrators had no intercourse with each other, directly or indirectly. On these grounds there are fourteen instances cited, which had been better omitted. They are nos. 8, 9, 23, 25, 27, 31, 33, 36, 40, 44, 48, 51, 55, and 56. Not one of these, I may say, had escaped my notice, but I did not deem it wise to mention any of them; for, though they might come in useful as confirming our theory, when it has been established by other evidence, yet when adduced as *proof*, they do but injure the cause they are intended to serve, because, in themselves considered, they can be accounted for without the hypothesis of a common source.

γ. Though the cases which Dr. Resch adduces were,

with one or two exceptions, all known to me, there were only three of them which I ventured in the April article to adduce, in the initial stage of the argument, as furnishing sufficient evidence of being variant translations of the same word in a Semitic document; and these are all quite as favourable to the hypothesis of an Aramaic as of a Hebrew original. These are nos. 28, 29, and 58. I admit that the Hebrew נִשָּׁן explains the three variants λαμβάνειν, αἶρειν, and βαστάζειν, as well as the Aramaic ܢܫܢ; but I scarcely think that ܢܫܢ covers the meanings of σώζειν, περιποιεῖσθαι, and ζωογονεῖν so well as ܢܫܢ, nor that ܢܫܢ would suggest to three Greek translators the words λυσιτελεῖ, συμφέρει, and καλόν so readily as ܢܫܢ, which, as we have seen, possesses all these meanings in regular usage.

δ. Dr. Resch does not explain by this test any words that are really diverse in meaning. A Hebrew *Urevangelium* would, for instance, leave ὀφειλήματα and ἁμαρτίας in the Lord's prayer unexplained, for there is no one Hebrew word which possesses both these meanings. Our author, moreover, makes no use of the fact that many Hebrew verbs now spelt alike are really of distinct origin, and on this account possess meanings which cannot be subsumed under any one fundamental conception. In fact, Dr. Resch adduces no one case in which his Hebrew hypothesis explains genuinely diverse words that lie abreast of each other in the Greek harmony. That such instances exist in large numbers is evident, and any theory which supposes the parallel synoptic passages to be translated from a common source ought to attempt their elucidation.

ε. There are about ten cases left, all more or less impressive, and, as defending a counter-hypothesis, we are bound to examine whether they admit of as clear an explanation — or perhaps clearer — on the theory of an Aramaic, as of a Hebrew, *Urevangelium*. We attach the numbers on the foregoing list.

1 and 3. As to the homologues 1 and 3, no one would contend that the Aramaic ܐܘܢ = one, is not as suitable as the Hebrew אֶחָד. Both can be used for the ordinal adjective πρώτη, and both can be used for the indefinite pronoun τις.

14. Dr. Resch is, as I believe, quite correct in seeing in σῶμα, a body, and πτώμα, a carcase, an indication of translation. The passage is, "Wherever the carcase (Luke, body) is, there will the eagles be gathered together"; and our author suggests the Hebrew word פֶּנֶר as solving the difficulty. But there is this objection: the Hebrew פֶּנֶר nowhere means a body, but only a carcase or corpse; whereas the Aramaic cognate פֶּנֶר means both a living body and a corpse, as in Proverbs x. 13, "The rod for the body of him that is lacking in discretion." We submit then that, so far as this word is concerned, the assumption of the word פֶּנֶר in an Aramaic exemplar is more likely to have led to the Greek variants σῶμα and πτώμα than the occurrence of פֶּנֶר in a Hebrew text.

16. Dr. Resch adduces the two slightly divergent Greek words that are used, when, at the last supper, our Lord "gave thanks" before breaking the bread, εὐλογήσας and εὐχαριστήσας; and rightly gives the word בִּרְךְ as the equivalent—a word which has the same significance in Aramaic as in Hebrew. It was not our intention to adduce this case however, because the narrative of the last supper as given in Luke bears no evidence of having been translated from the same source as was used by the first two evangelists. In fact, we fail to find in any part of the Judæan ministry, except the great eschatological discourse, any satisfactory evidence that the narratives were translated from the same Aramaic document. After most laborious efforts, the divergences which occur in the Judæan narratives obstinately refuse to yield to our hypothesis, further than that, as in the case before us, we find two or more Greek words used to represent an

action, place, or thing, more familiarly known by an Aramaic word. We should not have ventured to suppose, for instance, that the four equivalents for "the porch" in no. 51, nor the words for "scourging" in no. 36, afford any evidence worth naming of translation from a common Semitic document.

20. In the last beatitude, in which our Lord congratulates those who shall suffer for their adherence to Himself, there occur the variant parallels :

Matt. v. 11 : *καὶ εἰπωσι καθ' ὑμῶν πᾶν πονηρόν.*

And shall speak against you every evil thing.

Luke vi. 22 : *καὶ ἐκβάλωσι τὸ ὄνομα ὑμῶν ὡς πονηρόν.*

And shall cast out your name as evil.

Dr. Resch would give *יהפרונכנו* as the equivalent of the two entire phrases, being encouraged in this by the fact that in a quotation of this passage in *Hermas* the single verb *βλασφημεῖν* is used. We should have thought that *הרה* would be required for *ὀνειδίσωσιν*, "they shall reproach you"; but let that pass. It was our intention to give the Aramaic verb *ܘܠܗ* as the equivalent, not of the whole clauses, but of the parts *εἰπωσι καθ' ὑμῶν*, and *ἐκβάλωσι τὸ ὄνομα ὑμῶν*. That *εἰπεῖν κατά* was used in a stronger sense than lies on the surface, and meant to revile, execrate, curse, or blaspheme, is evident from Acts vi. 13, where, in the heat of their malignity, the accusers of Stephen said: "This fellow ceaseth not to speak words against (*ρήματα λαλῶν κατά*) this holy place and the law." So Jude 15. And *ἐκβαλεῖν τὸ ὄνομα*, "to cast out the name," may mean to utter the name with contempt or with a malediction; or it may refer to the terrible curse which the synagogue pronounced on those who were adjudged finally apostate. These meanings are covered by the Aramaic word *ܘܠܗ*, which means to curse, execrate, blaspheme. It is, *e.g.*, used of Shimei, 2 Sam. xix. 21; of Balaam, Num. xxiii. 11; and of the unnatural son, Lev. xx. 9.

While the above explanation seems adequate to account for the divergence, there is another which has perhaps equal claim on our acceptance; namely, that the Aramaic copy used by the evangelist Luke contained some form of the the verb טויל = to throw or cast forth, instead of לוט; יטלו instead of ילטו: a case of the transposition of two letters, a clerical error inevitably found in all MSS. If יטלו occurred in the MSS. used by Luke, he would be obliged to explain it by an appeal to the word טויל, and would thus render, "they shall cast you, or, your name, out as evil." This solution is the more likely, as we hope by-and-by to adduce other cases where the transposition of two Aramaic letters explains the divergence in our Greek Gospels.

Further, we have seen that Dr. Resch would take each of the two phrases that we have quoted as one complex whole, and would regard each as a free rendering of some form of the one word חרף. But is this probable? Do not the parallel phrases πᾶν πονηρόν and ὡς πονηρόν point to some equivalent in the Semitic document? Dr. Resch has not recognised that, on his hypothesis of a Hebrew *Urschrift*, the same kinds of divergence are to be expected as confessedly occur in the several translations of the Hebrew Scriptures, or he would have conjectured that, in πᾶν πονηρόν and ὡς πονηρόν, we have respectively כל רע and כרע. In Aramaic, this would be כל ביש and כביש, the omission of the one letter ל explaining the difference between the two Greek readings.

39. These parallel passages refer to the close of Christ's temptation in the wilderness, when Matthew and Luke both say that "the devil departed from Him"; but Matthew uses the word ἀφίησιν, Luke, ἀπέστη. The narration of this event in the *Clementine Homilies* runs thus: "Albeit, the king of the ungodly, having attempted in many ways to seduce the King of the godly to do his will, and being unable, desisted" (ἐπαύσατο). Dr. Resch adduces this as

part evidence of the existence of a primitive Hebrew Gospel. He holds that these three slightly divergent Greek words bear marks of being a translation of the same Hebrew word in a primitive Gospel, and that the author of the *Clementine Homilies* made use of this *Urschrift*, as well as our two Greek evangelists. For my own part, I am hopeful that evidence can be adduced from the sub-apostolic age of the circulation of a Semitic Gospel; but the paraphrastic nature of the quotation in the *Homilies* in this case makes one doubtful whether any dependence can be placed upon it. At all events, if לָרַח=he ceased, desisted, suits the requirements of a Hebrew Gospel, it cannot be denied that רָצַף מָן would in Aramaic even more completely cover the meanings of the three Greek words. This is rendered clear from the following occurrences of רָצַף in the Targums.

- Exod. iv. 26: The Targum of Jonathan narrates that when Zipporah had circumcised Gershom, "the destroying angel *ceased from* Moses, so that Zipporah gave thanks."
- Prov. xvii. 13: Evil shall not depart from his house.
- Job vii. 16: Let me alone, or, depart from me (רָצַף מִי; LXX., ἀπόστα ἀπ' ἐμοῦ), for my life is vain.
- Job xiv. 6: Cease from him, let his wound cease, until he shall receive his reward as a hireling in his day.

43. This illustration is taken from the scene on the mount of transfiguration. We will present the context in parallelism, and show what support it affords to our own theory.

ΜΑΤΤ. xvii. 1, 2.	ΜΑΡΚ ix. 2, 3.	ΛΟΥΚ ix. 28, 29.
ἀναφέρει αὐτοὺς	ἀναφέρει αὐτοὺς	ἀνέβη
εἰς ὄρος	εἰς ὄρος	εἰς τὸ ὄρος
ὑψηλὸν	ὑψηλὸν	προσεύξασθαι.
κατ' ἰδίαν	κατ' ἰδίαν μόνους	
καὶ	καὶ	καὶ ἐγένετο
ἔμπροσθεν αὐτῶν	ἔμπροσθεν αὐτῶν	ἐν τῷ προσεύχασθαι αὐτὸν
μετεμορφώθη.	μετεμορφώθη.	τὸ εἶδος τοῦ προσώπου αὐτοῦ
		ἕτερον.

In the third line we have *ύψηλόν* standing abreast with *προσεύξασθαι*. Do the words possessing these meanings resemble each other in Aramaic, so that one might easily be mistaken for the other? We think so. The usual Aramaic word meaning "to pray" is the Pael *לָצַ*, which is precisely equivalent to *προσεύχομαι*, in that it implies a reverent posture in prayer, kneeling, with penitent, down-cast eyes. The infinitive of this verb is *לָצַ*. But the adjective meaning "very high," "summus, excelsus," *ύψηλός*, is *לָצַ*. It occurs frequently in the phrase "the most high God," as in Genesis xiv. 18, etc.; but it is also used of physical things. It is used, for instance, in Genesis i. 7, of "the waters that are above the firmament," which in the Jerusalem Targum are called *לָצַ*, "the waters that are above," in contrast to the *לָצַ*, "the waters that are beneath." So Psalm civ. 13: "He waters the mountains from the place of His lofty reservoirs." The Hebrew has "His chambers." Job xxxvii. 9, "From His lofty chamber cometh the tempest." If, as modern scholars are agreed, the mount of transfiguration was Hermon, which is three times as high as the loftiest summits of Judæa and Galilee, this explains the occurrence of *לָצַ* = very high, instead of the common Targumic word *רָם* = high. The only difference therefore in Aramaic between *προσεύξασθαι* and *ύψηλόν* in an unvocalized text is that between *צ* and *ץ*. The former is *לָצַ*, the latter *לָצַ*. I admit most readily that, if this instance stood *alone*, it might be purely accidental; but if these cases are sufficiently multiplied to "eliminate chance," if about forty instances can be adduced, as we hope to do presently, in which the change of one letter accounts for the divergence in our Greek Gospels, then surely chance will be eliminated and the theory substantiated.

On the first line, we have Matthew and Mark in unison with *ἀναφέρει αὐτούς*, "He led them up"; while Luke gives

ἀνέβη, "He went up." I would submit that these variants are due to the difference between the Peal ܪܕܝܢ, "He went up," and its causative, the Aphel, ܪܕܝܢܘܘܬܐ or ܪܕܝܢܘܬܐ, "He led up"; though of course, when Luke had deciphered the word which Matthew and Mark render ὑψηλόν, as meaning "to pray," consistency alone would perhaps suggest ἀνέβη, instead of ἀναφέρει.

The next parallels that we would endeavour to elucidate are those to which Dr. Resch alludes; namely, μεταμορφώθη, which occurs in Matthew and Mark, and ἕτερον, which is found in all the Greek MSS. of Luke except D. This remarkable MS. gives ἡλλοιωθή, and this reading is quoted by Origen. It is perhaps unnecessary to remind readers of THE EXPOSITOR of the way in which Bishop Wordsworth sought to account for this divergence. He held that Luke declined the use of μεταμορφώθη, lest he might awaken in the minds of his Greek readers any ideas or feelings connected with the fabulous metamorphoses of their heathen deities. This view was sanctioned by Dean Alford, and is also warmly defended by the Rev. Arthur Wright, who, in his recent work on the *Composition of the Four Gospels*, says: "The Gentile catechists knew that a metamorphosis would suggest wrong ideas to a Greek mind. It would recall the fables of Zeus changing into a bull or a swan, or would suggest to the Latins Ovid's fifteen books of *Metamorphoses*. In St. Luke accordingly we find the word removed and a new rendering substituted, 'the form of His countenance became different'" (pp. 50, 51). This is very plausible. It is one of the best attempts I remember to explain the divergences in the synoptists by subjective criticism; but the probability which it yields can never transcend subjectivity. We can never *know* that that was really Luke's motive. The hypothesis can lay no claim to be scientific. One of the conditions to which such hypotheses must conform is, that they "admit of verification

or disproof, or at least of being rendered more or less probable by subsequent investigation.”

In the theory of Resch, as well as in the one advocated in these papers, an attempt is made to substitute for this subjective plausibility a hypothesis which certainly admits of proof or disproof; namely, that the divergences are due to a variant translation of a Semitic document.

In the case before us, Dr. Resch suggests that the common Hebrew word was הִשְׁתַּנְּהוּ; but this does not explain the whole difficulty. The divergence in the parallel passages extends beyond the verb, thus :

He was transfigured before them.

The form of His countenance became different.

The remainder of each sentence ought not to be ignored, and I would now offer the elucidation at which I arrived some months ago. The Aramaic verb that I would employ is cognate to the above Hebrew verb: it is נִשְׁנַי—or as it is otherwise written, שְׁנַי. This verb in Peal means to be or become different, “anders sein, werden”; in Pael, to make different, to alter, change. The occurrences of the Peal of נִשְׁנַי are instructive.

Deut. xxxiv. 7: The glorious splendour of his (Moses’) face was not *altered*.

Dan. iii. 27: The hosen of the three Hebrew youths, after they came out of the furnace, “were not *changed*.” (LXX., ἡλλοιώθη).

Dan. v. 9: Then was king Belshazzar greatly troubled, and his countenance *was changed* in him. (אִשְׁנַי יְהִי יְהִי; LXX., ἡ μορφή αὐτοῦ ἡλλοιώθη ἐν αὐτῷ.)

Dan. vi. 17: The stone was sealed at the mouth of the den of lions, that the purpose concerning Daniel might not be *changed* (μὴ ἀλλοιωθῆ).

Dan. vii. 3: Four great beasts came up from the sea, *different* (אִשְׁנַי) one from another.

Esther iii. 8: There is a people scattered abroad, . . . and their laws are *different* from those of every people.

Shall I now have any difficulty in persuading my readers that *ἔτερον, ἡλλοιώθη*, and *μετεμορφώθη* are diverse renderings of the one word שְׁנִי or הָיִי שְׁנִי? Or, if it be thought necessary that the word *μετεμορφώθη* requires the passive of the Pael, we shall obtain הָיִי מְשַׁנֵּי = was caused to change, was altered.

But what of the rest of the clause? The equivalent of *ἔμπροσθεν αὐτῶν*, "in their presence," is בְּאַנְפִּיהוֹן, and of *τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ*, His countenance, אֲנַפְיָהוּ. While for *εἶδος* = form, appearance, the most suitable word is הַזֵּוּ, which occurs

Esther ii. 2: Let virgins who are fair in appearance (הַזֵּוּן הַיָּפִי; LXX., *καλὰ τῶ εἶδει*), be sought for the king's approval.

Isa. liii. 2: In this passage the Targum sadly mars the original Hebrew as it renders: "His *appearance* (הַזֵּוּן; LXX., *εἶδος*) is not as the appearance of an ordinary man, nor the fear He inspires like that of an uneducated man (הַיָּיִט = *ιδιώτης*); but the splendour of holiness is His, so that all who see Him shall gaze at Him."

We would suggest therefore that the difference between the third Gospel and the other two has arisen from a slightly variant text.

Luke requires וְהוּוּ דֵאנְפֹרְהִי שְׁנִי,

Matthew and Mark וְהוּוּ בְּאַנְפִּיהוֹן שְׁנִי.

Of course in such cases the full amount of variation which our Greek text requires may not have existed in the Aramaic document. Let *one* word be miswritten or misread, and the rest must be pressed in order to give suitable sense.

45. In this instance Dr. Resch compares Matthew xxiv. 27, *φαίνεσθαι*, D *φαίνειν*, with Luke xvii. 24, *λάμπειν*, D *ἀστράπτειν*, and claims that the Hebrew הַאִיר explains the variants. If the primitive Gospel was Hebrew, this is probable; but if it was Aramaic, נְהַר would explain them

equally well. But there is another couplet in the same passage which Dr. Resch does not mention.

MATT. xxiv. 27.
 ὡσπερ γὰρ ἡ ἀστραπή
 ἐξέρχεται
 ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν
 καὶ φαίνεται
 ἕως δυσμῶν.

LUKE xvii. 24.
 ὡσπερ γὰρ ἡ ἀστραπή
 ἀστράπτουσα
 ἐκ τῆς ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανὸν
 λάμπει
 εἰς τὴν ὑπ' οὐρανόν.

Does the hypothesis of a Hebrew *Urevangelium* shed any light on the variants ἐξέρχεται and ἀστράπτουσα? We are not told. The Aramaic equivalent of ἐξέρχεσθαι is ܕܘܢܐ, which occurs twice in biblical Aramaic, Daniel ii. 5 and 8, "The word has gone out from me." The verb used of the shining or flashing forth of light is ܕܘܢܐ, Aphel of ܕܘܢ.

- Prov. iv. 18: The path of the just is like the light which shineth forth (ܕܘܢܐ), and its light goes on unto the perfection of the day.
- Isa. ix. 2: They that dwell in the land of the shadow of death, upon them hath the light shone.
- 2 Sam. xxiii. 4: He shall be as the light of the morning, when the sun shines; i.e. flashes or breaks forth.

There are thus two probabilities before us by which to account for the variant ἐξέρχεται. Either we have two readings, ܕܘܢܐ and ܕܘܢܐ; or, since ܕܘܢܐ denotes, as we have seen, the breaking forth of light on preceding darkness, ἐξέρχεται may be a free rendering of ܕܘܢܐ.

50. Dr. Resch here gives ܕܘܢܐ, "what they had seen," as the Hebrew equivalent of the three expressions, τὸ ὄραμα (Matt. xvii. 9), ἃ εἶδον (Mark ix. 9), and ὧν ἑώρακαν (Luke ix. 36). This explanation of course answers well for the last two, but leaves τὸ ὄραμα = "the vision," to be considered as a free translation. Now if in Aramaic the three phrases closely resemble each other, we shall once more claim the advantage. The Aramaic equivalent of ܕܘܢܐ is ܕܘܢܐ or ܕܘܢܐ; whereas the word for τὸ ὄραμα is ܕܘܢܐ or ܕܘܢܐ.

Ezek. i. 1: I saw in prophet vision (בְּחִזְוֵי נְבוּאָה).

Dan. ii. 19: The mystery was revealed to Daniel in a vision of the night (סִגְרֵי לַיְלָה נִבְּרָה; LXX., ἐν δράματι τῆς νυκτός).
So vii. 13.

Dan. iv. 10: In visions of my head (בְּחִזְוֵי רִאשִׁי; LXX., ἐν δράματι τῆς νυκτός).

According to our theory therefore, the difference of one letter in an unvocalized text explains the divergence. Matthew and Mark require כְּרָאוּ = what they had seen; Luke כִּוּוּ, or perhaps כִּוּוּ = the vision.

Granted then the existence of a Semitic document as the source of much of the common matter of the Synoptists, was it written in Hebrew or in Aramaic? That question remains now for others to answer. We have shown that Dr. Resch's evidence is incomplete *in kind*, and therefore until the attempt has been made to apply Hebrew in the same variety of ways as we have applied the Aramaic, we ought in fairness to wait for a final answer. There are however some of our strongest points to which Hebrew affords no solution, and we have shown that in those cases which Dr. Resch explains by an appeal to Hebrew, the Aramaic proves equally efficacious, in some cases much more so, and therefore for the present we may rightly claim the advantage. Dr. Resch, we may add, devotes some few pages to "extra-canonical quotations from the *Urevangelium*," in which he endeavours to show that the diversity in the Gospel quotations in the early Fathers presupposes a Hebrew original. This opens up a wide and deeply interesting subject for inquiry—a subject which Dr. Resch has made pre-eminently his own, and in which, as throughout the whole of his admirable treatise, we shall often delight to sit at his feet, wishing however most sincerely that he could see that Aramaic, and not Hebrew, is the master-key.

J. T. MARSHALL.

DR. MARTINEAU AND THE GOSPELS.

IN an address recently delivered at University Hall, Dr. Martineau (according to a newspaper report) selected Matthew xxiii. 35 (with its reference to Zacharias the son of Barachias) as a passage helping to demonstrate the comparatively late date and the untrustworthiness of the Gospels. The report runs as follows :

“ Christ inveighs against the Scribes and Pharisees and hypocrites, and charges them with the guilt of all the blood shed from Abel down to Zacharias the son of Barachias, ‘ whom *ye* slew between the temple and the altar.’ This last event must have been fresh in recollection ; it was the latest crime, the lecturer argued, committed by those who were addressed. Now Josephus gives an account of this crime in his histories. In the end of the Jewish war, which finished with the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus in the year 70, Zacharias the son of Baruch—that is, Barachias—was slain in the temple by a tumultuous mob, because he was a moderate man, and was disposed to make terms with the Romans. Yet—here was Dr. Martineau’s startling conclusion—this very crime is mentioned by Jesus, who died in the year 30, thirty-eight years before, as having been committed by those whom He was denouncing.”

This report is obviously a mere abstract, and cannot be taken to represent the close historical criticism which, I have reason to believe, Dr. Martineau laid before his audience. But I can hardly be wrong in assuming that he offered the identity of the Zacharias of Matthew and the Zacharias of Josephus as a premiss of conspicuous force. Whether therefore the report, as a whole, does justice to Dr. Martineau or not, those who were “ startled ” by his conclusion may be interested to see what there is to be said on the other side.

I have no right, on the authority of an abstract, to conclude that the lecturer propounded his parenthesis—“ that is, Barachias ”—as a universally acknowledged fact, or as a fact which at least deserves universal acknowledgment ;

such however is the practical effect produced by the newspaper report upon its readers. But the evidence that Zacharias the son of Baruch was the same as Zacharias the son of Barachias is not by any means solid enough to sustain the edifice Dr. Martineau erects upon it. First of all, there is no proof whatever that Baruch and Barachias were convertible names. John Lightfoot, it is true, accepts their equivalence, but he accepts it without any attempt at justification; his manner of speaking is as curt as Dr. Martineau's seems to have been, for in his *Exercitations on St. Matthew*, vol. xi. p. 289 (English translation), we find a similarly insinuated parenthesis: "Zacharias the son of Baruch (*which is the same thing with Barachias*)."

But all the evidence that we have is against this somewhat hasty identification. In the Septuagint Version the Hebrew *Baruch* is always transliterated into *Βαρούχ*, while *Βαραχίας* (once, apparently, *Βαραχία*, 1 Chron. xv. 23) is the invariable reproduction of the Hebrew *Berechiah* (cf. 1 Chron. vi. 39, 2 Chron. xxviii. 12, Zech. i. 1). In the book of Nehemiah the two names *Βαρούχ* and *Βαραχίας* stand several times for different persons; the former for *Baruch* the son of Zabbai (iii. 20, x. 6) and *Baruch* the son of Colhozeh (xi. 5); and the latter for *Berechiah*, the father of Meshullam (iii. 30), who helped in rebuilding the walls of the holy city. These names are never known to be confused. In Josephus also they are quite distinct, though he is not content with the transliteration of *Baruch*, but Grecises it into *Βαροῦχος*; and in the passage to which Dr. Martineau refers, found in the *Wars of the Jews* iv. 5. 4, the expression is *Ζαχαρίας υἱὸς Βαρούχου*. Dr. Neubauer tells me that in rabbinical literature, from 1000 to 1500 A.D., the names were not considered identical, neither are they now convertible among the Jews. That the names differ in signification may not go for much; but *Baruch* is Latinised by Gesenius into *Benedictus* (blessed),

while he translates Berechiah by *Cui benedicet vel benedixit Jehova*, "He whom Jehovah will bless, or has blessed." We may fairly therefore refuse to admit the vitally important parenthesis of Lightfoot and Dr. Martineau, and affirm that Baruch is not the same as Barachias; whereupon Dr. Martineau's appeal to Josephus becomes, for us at least, very questionable, and his reliance upon it as an ancillary proof of the late date and untrustworthiness of our Matthew correspondingly unjustifiable.

But this is not the whole of the case for the defendant. According to Matthew's account, Jesus painted the enormity with heightened colour by reminding the Jews how they had slain Zacharias "between the sanctuary (*ναός*) and the altar"; or, as Luke phrases it, "between the altar and the house (of God)." Now the space here referred to was in the court reserved exclusively for the priests, and was specially sacred, this court being the inmost court of all the temple precinct, and reaching up to the steps of the sanctuary itself. But Zacharias the son of *Baruch* was, according to Josephus, murdered by two Zealots "in the midst of the temple" (*ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ ἱεροῦ*). The spot Josephus indicates was, in all probability, the "court of the Israelites," separated by a barrier from the "court of the priests." Josephus has left us a minute account of the temple and its various divisions, and may be relied upon to remember the differences between one part and another. Whiston (who knew his Josephus), in his note upon this passage, declines to "believe that our Josephus, who always persists on the peculiar sacredness of the inmost court, and of the holy house that was in it, would have omitted so material an aggravation of this barbarous murder, as perpetrated in a place so very holy, had that been the true place of it." And Whiston's view is supported by the fact that Zacharias the son of Baruch, not being a priest, but only a citizen, would naturally have been found, not in the court

of the priests, but in that of the Israelites. Further, Josephus gives no hint that the Zealots had as yet profaned the inmost court; and when they do profane it several months later, he takes care to record the profanity (see *Wars of the Jews* v. 1. 2). All that he says on this occasion is that "two of the most audacious (Zealots) fell upon and murdered Zacharias in the midst of the temple." And from the rest of the account, before and after, we are led to think of some part of the temple near to the place where Zacharias had just been tried and acquitted by an improvised court of seventy of the principal citizens; and judicial assemblies sat in one of the outer courts of the temple. The very fact moreover that this murder was altogether against the will of these citizen judges, who acquitted Zacharias, "as choosing rather to die themselves with him than to have his death laid at their doors,"—would somewhat blunt the edge of Christ's general accusation against the Jewish nation.

But if Zacharias the son of Baruch is for such reasons unsuitable to our passage, who was the Zacharias son of Barachias therein mentioned?

The common explanation is that he was the same as the Zacharias son of Jehoiada whose murder is recorded in 2 Chronicles xxiv. 20. It is an explanation accepted not only by the orthodox apologist, but also by critics like Schürer and Holtzmann, who may be regarded as indifferent to apology. Holtzmann, it is true, mentions the hypothesis adopted by Dr. Martineau, but introduces it with a depreciatory "wofern nicht," as a hypothesis of inferior probability. (See *Hand Commentar*, i. 255; also Schürer, *Jewish People*, English translation, ii. i. 309.) I cannot see why, in spite of certain difficulties, this explanation should not be considered rational and credible. It was most natural for Christ to have taken, as examples of the righteous blood shed upon the earth, the first and last

murders recorded within the compass of the Jewish canon, according to the conventional order of the books. In the strict order of chronology the death of Urijah, recounted in Jeremiah xxvi. 20-23, came later; but in the canon the book of Jeremiah stood eleventh and the books of Chronicles twentieth, according to the enumeration of Jerome "as that customary among the Jews." And, in the words of Schürer, "According to the order of the canon, the assassination related in 2 Chronicles is certainly the last." This assassination was viewed in rabbinical literature with special abhorrence. The Talmuds both of Jerusalem and of Babylon (see Lightfoot xi. 288) declare that the blood continued to bubble till Nebuzaradan had slain 94,000 priests, old and young, to appease it." "They committed seven wickednesses in that day [of the murder]. They killed a priest, a prophet, a judge; they shed the blood of an innocent man; they polluted the court [of the priests]; and that day was the sabbath day and the day of expiation." In regard to this murder and that of Abel, and these alone, there is in the Old Testament the same cry for vengeance. "Behold," says God in Genesis iv. 10, "the voice of thy brother's blood crieth out to Me." "And when [Zechariah] died, he said, The Lord look upon it, and require it" (2 Chron. xxiv. 22). Furthermore it is noticeable, though not of course convincing, that when our Lord in Matthew xxiii. 37 (two verses later) laments over Jerusalem, "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that *killest* the prophets, and *stonest* them which are sent unto thee," the *stonest*, the word of specialization, suits the case of Zacharias the son of Jehoiada, and not that of Zacharias the son of Baruch, who was slain with the sword (see Josephus, *Wars of the Jews*, l.c.; and as to Zacharias son of Jehoiada, *Antiqq.* ix. 8, 3).

The following points moreover make in favour of the common explanation. (1) Christ says (ver. 34), "Behold,

I send unto you *prophets*." In 2 Chronicles xxiv. 19 we read: "Yet He sent *prophets* to them: . . . but they would not give ear. And the Spirit of the Lord came upon Zechariah the son of Jehoiada the priest." And in Josephus *Antiqq.* ix. 8, 3 we are told that "God had appointed him to *prophecy*." But Josephus in no way suggests that Zacharias the son of Baruch was anything more than one of the most eminent of the citizens of Jerusalem, who hated wickedness and loved liberty; who "was also a rich man, so that by taking him off they (the Zealots) did not only hope to seize his effects, but also to get rid of a man that had great power to destroy them." (2) Zechariah the son of Jehoiada, being a priest, was naturally to be found in the court of the priests; the son of Baruch would never have set foot in it. (3) Rabbinical literature, so horrified at the murder of the son of Jehoiada, has not a word to say about the murder of the son of Baruch.

But how can we account for Berechiah (Barachias) supplanting Jehoiada? Two solutions of the difficulty are offered, neither of them, I venture to think, in the least degree unreasonable. The one is suggested by the fact that sometimes in the Old Testament a man is spoken of as the son of his grandfather. This is the case with another Zechariah, namely, the minor prophet. At the beginning of his prophecy he is called "Zechariah the son of Berechiah, the son of Iddo," but twice in Ezra (v. 1, vi. 14) he is called "Zechariah the son of Iddo." We are told that Jehoiada was 130 years old when he died; he might have had a son Berechiah (a name apparently common in the Zechariah families of the Old Testament; there is another Zechariah, the son of Je-Berechiah,—LXX., *Βαραχίου*; Babylonian Talmud, *Berechiah*,—Isaiah viii. 2); and as Jehoiada lived to so great an age, his son Berechiah might have died before him, leaving

Zechariah to be popularly, though not invariably, known as the son of the surviving head of the family, and to be immediately, though not invariably, connected by subsequent tradition with a name so famous in Israelitish history, Jehoiada, the great high priest and king-maker. Surely this solution cannot be scouted as a thing incredible. The other solution (which seems to me on the whole more probable) is suggested by the paternity of the same minor prophet. He was the best known Zechariah, and tradition might easily have attached the name of his father Berechiah to his less famous namesake, especially as *Zechariah* and *Berechiah* were names, it would appear, not unfrequently associated. And our Lord or his reporter might, just as easily and naturally, have followed the traditional nomenclature. We are not without evidence that, in some quarters, at a very early date, Zechariah the son of Jehoiada was believed to have been intended. This was the reading, according to Jerome, found in the *Gospel of the Nazarenes*; the Codex Sinaiticus, and at least four cursives (three of them lectionaries) omit the words *υιου Βαραχίου*, and there is no doubt whatever that the true reading of the parallel passage in Luke (xi. 51) is simply *Zacharias*.

But Dr. Martineau lays great stress on *ἐφρονέσατε*, "ye slew": "it was the latest crime," he adds, "committed by those who were addressed." I do not see why this point should be made so much of. There is no emphatic *ye* in the Greek, and the second person is the natural expression of solidarity. "Ye have been (says Christ) a murderous nation. Your history, from first to last, is a history of murders of righteous men and of prophets. And such, in the future, will be the climax of your wickedness, that ye will constitute yourselves the rightful heirs to all the vengeance called for by the righteous blood whose shedding your Scriptures have recorded." The "ye" in regard to

the blood of Zacharias involves nothing like so great a strain upon the idea of solidarity as does Christ's idea of heirship to the blood of Abel; and the "ye" is, after all, less appropriate to the murder of Baruch's son by two Zealots against the will of priests and people, than to the murder of Jehoiada's son by king and princes and multitude.

I shall be reminded, of course, that the proffered solutions are conjectural. But so also are the placid affirmations that Baruch is the same as Berechiah, and that the murder spoken of was committed thirty-eight years after the words are said to have been uttered, and that consequently Matthew's Gospel, as we have it, is a late and untrustworthy composition. As a matter of fact, there are conjectures on both sides, and we have to choose between them. And while, as I believe, the Zacharias of the Chronicles seems to satisfy best the more vital requirements of the case, the conjectures incidental to the establishment of this belief are, at least, as reasonable as those favoured by Dr. Martineau.

JOHN MASSIE.

BREVIA.

Psalms of Solomon.—It is well known that two of the psalms in our Psalter have the heading "To Solomon." These are not the only psalms however which have been ascribed to the wise king. Not to mention the collection of psalms of Pharisaean origin, which in the Greek version bears the title *Ψαλμοὶ* (or *Ψαλτήριον*) *Σολομῶντος*—a title for which the psalmists themselves can hardly be held responsible—there appears to be a fragment of an early psalm ascribed to Solomon in the First Book of Kings. It was Wellhausen who first pointed this out (see Bleek's *Einleitung*, ed. 4, p. 236), but his restoration may be compared with Klostermann's, in his work on Samuel and Kings in Strack's series of commentaries. The passage may have run thus,

“The sun hath Yahveh set up in heaven ;
 (But) he said he would (himself) dwell in darkness ;
 I have built a high mansion for thee,
 A place for thee to dwell in for all ages.”

Lines 2, 3, and 4 are given in 1 Kings viii. 12, 13 as a speech of Solomon before his benediction. It needs however no remarkable divining power to see that ver. 14 ought to follow ver. 12; and this suspicion is confirmed by the fact that the Septuagint gives vers. 12, 13 in a more complete form (*i.e.* with the addition of the opening line given above), with an introductory and a closing formula after ver. 33: Τότε ἐλάλησε Σολομὼν ὑπὲρ τοῦ οἴκου, ὡς συνετέλεσε τοῦ οἰκοδομῆσαι αὐτὸν, Ἥλιον ἔστησεν ἐν οὐρανῷ Κύριος, καὶ εἶπε τοῦ κατοικεῖν ἐν γνόφῳ· Οἰκοδομήσον οἶκόν μου, εὐπρεπῆ σεαυτῷ, τοῦ κατοικεῖν ἐπὶ καινότητος. Οὐκ ἰδοὺ αὐτῆ γέγραπται ἐπὶ βιβλίον τῆς ᾠδῆς ; I have here followed Lucian, who reads ἔστησεν for ἐγνώρισεν; but in lines 2, 3, and 4 I have not attempted to emend by the help of the Septuagint, feeling with Klostermann that the received text yields a finer sense than the Greek version (which at any rate itself needs some emendation). In lines 1 and 2 there is a contrast between the sun in his glorious heavenly mansion and the Creator who dwelleth in thick clouds. Then in lines 3 and 4 Solomon exclaims that he has built a lofty house (גָּבֹהַ, in the sense of “height”; Septuagint’s εὐπρεπῆ reminds us of ἐκ τῆς δόξης in Ps. xlvi. 14, Septuagint) for Yahveh, that men may no longer worship the sun instead of its Maker,—a house eternal as those heavens in which the sun is fixed (cf. Ps. lxxviii. 69a). καινότητος implies that עֲלִיּוֹת was misread עֲלִיּוֹת (the opposite of the mistake in Ps. lxxxix. 8, Isa. liv. 4, Septuagint), and τῆς ᾠδῆς = רִשְׁוֹן for רִשְׁוֹן (see *Variorum Bible* on Josh. x. 13).

This discovery would be of great importance, could it be shown that the passage had supplied a theme or motive to any passage of our canonical psalms. More than one writer have speculated as to the existence of Davidic fragments incorporated (with or without modification) in existing psalms. How precious this Solomonic fragment would be, if it agreed in some striking points with any part of Psalms lxxii. and cxxvii.! Alas! it does not. One may even, if it be worth while, argue from the transparent falseness of the title of Psalm cxxvii. (which implies, as it would seem, that the psalm was uttered by Solomon at the building of the temple) to the incorrectness of the tradition in 1 Kings. May not the

editor of the "Book of the Upright" have been mistaken? Still I would rather believe that the fragment *is* Solomonic, just as I cling to the reasonable belief that David himself also composed religious songs—if not those in which Delitzsch still believes, then some others which "tradition, Time's suspected register," has failed to hand down to us.

Isaiah lii. 15.—After a full discussion of the difficult word נִזְרָה (A.V., he shall sprinkle), which the present writer felt obliged to leave untranslated in his own version of Isaiah, Professor Moore, of Andover Theological Seminary, comes to the conclusion that נִזְרָה , shall be much moved, should probably be restored. Comp. Deuteronomy ii. 25, Isaiah lxiv. 1; in both instances commotion caused by what the peoples hear of Israel. The closest parallel is Jeremiah xxxiii. 9. Obviously the standard MS. of Isaiah was illegible at this point; the question is, how best to heal the corruption? Professor Moore disregards tradition altogether, and rightly, nor does he claim even the authority of the Septuagint, whose $\theta\alpha\nu\acute{\alpha}\sigma\omicron\nu\tau\alpha\iota$ may very well be a mere guess.

Job v. 21.—Some difficulty has been felt by students of the Book of Job in the sudden disappearance of the Satan from the machinery of the poem, and the non-mention of him in the speeches. Professor G. Hoffmann thinks he has restored a half-effaced reference to the Satan in Job v. 21 (*Phön. Inschriften*, p. 53; *Hjob*, p. 42). He renders the passage thus, "If the Slanderer (δ διάβολος) go to and fro, thou remainest hidden; thou hast naught to fear, if a demon cometh," with the gloss, "the demon of sickness," see Psalm xci. 6. This involves reading לֹא יִפְּחֵן for לֹא יִפְּחֵן in the first stichos, and וְיִפְּחֵן for וְיִפְּחֵן in the second. But the first part of the received text is supported by $\mu\acute{\alpha}\sigma\tau\iota\xi$ $\gamma\lambda\acute{\omega}\sigma\sigma\eta\varsigma$, Ecclesiasticus xxvi. 6, and the second by Proverbs iii. 25. If וְיִפְּחֵן be correct, we seem to catch the accents of later superstition. It is the Targum, not the psalmist, who introduces the *shedim* into the beautiful eulogy of faith (Ps. xci.). Nor does וְיִפְּחֵן occur anywhere in the Massoretic text.

T. K. CHEYNE.

IS THE APOSTOLIC LITURGY QUOTED BY
ST. PAUL ?

THE extant liturgies of the Church catholic are very numerous, and are preserved in many languages; yet may they all be collected and arranged in a few groups. Such groups are families, within which the members are united by the common possession of features derived from one parent type. But even the parents were originally related. Although the families are now very different in outward form, yet is it soon discovered by the attentive observer that they have all proceeded from some normal stock. The differences are not marks of distinct origin, but are the results of adaptation to local needs, in the use made by different revisers of the one common liturgical heritage. This common stock, which was the prototype of every extant liturgical form, we designate the *apostolic liturgy*. We cannot summarize its contents, but it must have contained whatsoever is common to the extant liturgies both of form and of expression. We cannot speak dogmatically of the age of these several common features, except to assert that they must have been accepted generally, not only before Christendom was rent by schisms, but even in the earliest days of the planting of the chief national Churches. History records no time when Antioch and Alexandria, Rome and Edessa, may have met to decide the form and order of their common celebration of the holy mysteries. The resemblances between the liturgies of these chief centres, in the essential features, must certainly be attributed to the labours of apostolic men, if not of the

Apostles themselves. They were imposed by the recognised authority of those who delivered the decrees and traditions to the first converts, and ordained the primitive elders.

Is that apostolic liturgy quoted in the New Testament? To such a question a complete answer cannot be given, because the apostolic liturgy is not before us in its entirety. While much has been added to the primitive form in the extant liturgies, it is also undeniable that much may have perished. There are many apparent quotations in the apostolic epistles which cannot be identified. They may be from liturgical forms not now extant. We know from Ephesians v. 19 that Christian hymns were already in use at that early date. From such canticles the passage in 1 Timothy vi. 15, 16¹ appears to be quoted. 1 Timothy iii. 16² reads like part of some profession of faith; still more does 1 Corinthians xv. 3³ resemble the form of a primitive creed.

But, further, it must be allowed that the resemblances between passages in the extant primitive liturgies and in the apostolic epistles are numerous and striking. To give examples. The Epistle to the Hebrews was perhaps addressed to those Christians for whom the *Liturgy of St. James* was primarily intended: certainly in x. 19, 20⁴ the author expressed himself in language which coincides in thought and even in terms with some phrases in the "Prayer of the Veil." Again, the "Prayer of the Oblation" in the same liturgy, and the passage from the Epistle to Titus (iii. 5, 6)⁵ have remarkable affinities; while the liturgical words, "passing by and blotting out the handwriting that is against us, Thy suppliants," at once call

¹ "The blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings," etc.

² "God was manifest in the flesh," etc.

³ "Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures," etc.

⁴ "Boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus, by a new and living way, which He hath consecrated for us."

⁵ "Not by works of righteousness which we have done," etc.

to mind a similar passage in Colossians ii. 14. In the *primitive Liturgy of St. Mark*, one of the earlier prayers is very much like that remarkable passage in 1 Timothy ii. 1,¹ wherein St. Paul, in the manner of a "bidding prayer," gives direction how prayer should be made.

An obvious explanation of what has been observed is, that the compilers of the liturgies have quoted the apostolic writings; but many of these apparent quotations are probably echoes of teaching received from the Apostles or their immediate successors. Citations from the Old Testament there certainly are; it is not denied that there may be also quotations from the New Testament; yet much was derived from tradition rather than directly from written documents. Many and independent indications of antiquity suggest that the oldest portions of the primitive liturgies were in use at a period so early that some of the books of the New Testament were not yet in general circulation, even if already written.

But there is one liturgical passage which surpasses in interest any of those yet named, and indeed all others of the same class. In the *Liturgy of St. James*, which is the norm of one of the most numerous groups, or families, there are words which have been pointed to as the source of the quotation made by St. Paul in 1 Corinthians ii. 9: "But as it is written, Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love Him." This view was unhesitatingly maintained by the late Dr. Littledale, who, with his colleague Dr. Neale, rendered such excellent service to Englishmen who are interested in catholic antiquities.² If this opinion can be accepted, it will not indeed

¹ "I exhort therefore, that, first of all, supplications, prayers," etc.

² The early liturgies were the daily study of Dr. Neale for many years. He could repeat nearly all the text by heart. The opinions of such students certainly deserve respectful consideration.

follow that the whole office now extant as the Liturgy of St. James was composed before A.D. 60, but it will be strong evidence that the central parts of this office were in existence in St. Paul's days. Some prayers, and many expressions, have been added to the office in subsequent revisions; but it will not be denied that the liturgy in its essential features has come down to us in its integrity from very early times. If then St. Paul quoted from the body of the work, in writing to the Corinthians, the Liturgy of St. James was known, and had been committed to writing, in the first half of the first century.

But here it must be pointed out (and this has to some extent escaped observation) that the Liturgy of *St. Mark* might claim equal antiquity on the same grounds. In that office also the words are found, but not in the same context. They are in the *anaphora* in each office; but in the Liturgy of St. James they are in the oblation which follows the consecration of the cup, whereas in the Alexandrian office they are introduced into the prayer which follows the reading of the diptychs. They cannot be original in both liturgies, and it must be confessed that the passage in which they occur in St. Mark does not bear such distinct marks of originality as that in which they are found in St. James: hence it has been argued that they were quoted from the latter liturgy by some reviser of the former. Still of this there is no proof, and more reasonable is it to suppose that they were part of the words of that apostolic liturgy which was the parent of the several extant families. Whoever was the author of this poetical passage, its preservation was insured by the beauty and rhythm of the phraseology; and this also secured it a place both in the Jerusalem and Alexandrian offices, although in a different connexion in each. In the *Syriac St. James* however the words are not found. The significance of the omission cannot be fully estimated until the true relation of the last

named office to the *Greek St. James* has been determined. It is not the relation of original and version; rather would it seem that the Greek and Syriac offices represent two adaptations in two different languages of the primitive liturgy, which was originally compiled in the vernacular of Palestine, a dialect related indeed to the cognate Syriac, but not identical with it. We learn from Acts vi. that Christians were found amongst the Hellenists at a very early period; therefore a Greek liturgy must have come into use almost contemporaneously with that designed for the Hebrew Christians. Now if the later revisers of the extant *St. Mark* and *Greek St. James* did not quote from St. Paul, then it is certainly possible, at all events arguable, that St. Paul quoted from that primitive Greek liturgy whence were derived the present forms of the *St. Mark* and *Greek St. James*.

The passage in 1 Corinthians reads thus: Ἀλλὰ, καθὼς γέγραπται Ἄ ὀφθαλμὸς οὐκ εἶδε, καὶ οὐς οὐκ ἤκουσε, καὶ ἐπὶ καρδίαν ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἀνέβη, ἃ [v.l. ὅσα] ἠτοίμασεν ὁ Θεὸς τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν αὐτόν. The introductory formula certainly suggests a biblical source. The term γέγραπται has borrowed a technical sense from its related noun. As γραφαί has become practically limited to *the book*, so has this particular tense of the verb come to be almost exclusively used in quotations from Sacred Writ. This general remark is true of the gospels and the epistles alike, but it will suffice now to limit observation to the *usus loquendi* of St. Paul. About this no doubt can be entertained.

1. In some thirty places where a citation is made, which is certainly from the Old Testament, and usually *verbatim*, such quotation is introduced by γέγραπται, with or without καθὼς. That other quotations from the Old Testament are differently introduced has no bearing on the inquiry.

2. No one of the non-scriptural quotations in the Pauline writings is introduced in this way. For example, in Titus

i. 12 the words of the Cretan poet are not introduced by *γέγραπται*, but by *εἶπέ τις ἐξ αὐτῶν ἴδιος αὐτῶν προφήτης*.

3. With the exception of the place in question, there is only one passage (1 Cor. iv. 6) where *γέγραπται* is not used with obvious reference to Scripture. The words are, *ἵνα ἐν ἡμῖν μάθητε τὸ μὴ ὑπὲρ ὃ γέγραπται φρονεῖν*. But any allusion to secular, or even ecclesiastical, writings is improbable. We must (with Theophylact) understand a reference to the sentiments already committed to writing by St. Paul about divisions; or (with Bengel) to the general teaching of the Bible. In either case the passage will hardly be an exception to the Pauline *usus* of *γέγραπται*.

4. It is also to be observed that, amongst the quotations from the Old Testament introduced by *γέγραπται*, some are not literal citations of the extant Septuagint text. Take, for example, Romans xii. 19, *γέγραπται γὰρ Ἐμοὶ ἐκδίκησις: ἐγὼ ἀνταποδώσω, λέγει Κύριος*, which appears to be a reference to Deuteronomy xxxii. 35, where however the Septuagint is *ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἐκδικήσεως ἀνταποδώσω*.

5. Again, in 1 Corinthians xiv. 21 ("In the law it is written, 'With men of other tongues and other lips' . . .") we may see that St. Paul would even unite a text from Deuteronomy xxviii. 49 with another in Isaiah xxviii. 11, 12, and yet under the common title of "written in the law": unless indeed we suppose, in spite of the *ἐν τῷ νόμῳ*, that the reference is wholly to Isaiah's words; for the resemblance is greater to those than to anything in Deuteronomy.

From these facts it would be reasonable to infer that the *γέγραπται* in 1 Corinthians ii. 9 introduces a quotation from Isaiah of words which are near enough to satisfy the conditions of the Pauline *usus citandi*; but on behalf of the liturgical origin of the passage, it has been declared that this quotation, "when tested by the Septuagint, proves to have only a superficial resemblance to it."

The supposed original in Isaiah lxiv. 4 reads as follows: *Ἀπὸ τοῦ αἰῶνος οὐκ ἠκούσαμεν, οὐδὲ οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ ἡμῶν εἶδον* [*v.l. ἴδον, cod. A*] *Θεὸν πλὴν σου* [*A om. a pr. m. Θεὸν πλὴν σου*], *καὶ τὰ ἔργα σου, ἃ ποιήσεις τοῖς ὑπομένουσιν ἔλεον.* Also we have at lxv. 16 the words, *ἐπιλήσονται γὰρ τὴν θλίψιν τὴν πρώτην, καὶ οὐκ ἀναβήσεται αὐτῶν ἐπὶ τὴν καρδίαν.* If St. Paul quoted from the Bible, it is almost certain that he employed the Septuagint. He was writing to the Greek-speaking Corinthians; and although for a special purpose he might have used a literal version of the Hebrew, this is not found to be the case here. At Isaiah lxiv. 4 the Hebrew, according to the Massoretic text, is: "And from old time they have not heard, they have not perceived with the ear, eye hath not seen, a God beside Thee, (who) acteth on behalf of him that waiteth for Him." The Vulgate changes the person: "Deus absque te, quæ præparasti expectantibus Te"; so the Peshitto—both have been corrupted by the Septuagint. As regards Isaiah lxv. 16 there is nothing in the Hebrew which would be the original of the *ἀναβήσεται ἐπὶ τὴν καρδίαν*; but in ver. 17 such Hebrew is found, where the Septuagint has *οὐ μὴ ἐπέλθῃ αὐτῶν ἐπὶ τὴν καρδίαν.*

One solution of the difficulties connected with the *form* of the Pauline quotation would be to suppose that the Apostle quotes from some type of text other than either the original Hebrew or the Septuagint, in fact, from an Aramaic version, or even recension, a text of Isaiah such as probably our Lord read from in the synagogue at Nazareth. This view is not indeed to be rejected summarily. There are not wanting indications that a recension of the Hebrew, in many respects divergent from the Massoretic text, was in use in Palestine in the first century. A trace is found in the remarkable citation from Micah in St. Matthew ii. 6, where the prophet's words are given by the evangelist in a form different from either the Hebrew or the Septuagint of

Micah. This recension may even have been extant in a kind of *targum* in Aramaized Hebrew; but since we must at present confess almost complete ignorance of the text, of the extent, and of the circulation of the earliest Jewish targums, we can derive no assistance from that quarter towards the solution of the question before us.

If we look in another direction, it is interesting and significant to observe that none of the Fathers even hint that St. Paul quoted from a liturgical source, although the suggestion is made that the Apostle cited an apocryphal work, or some lost part of Holy Writ. But often the Fathers introduce the words among other texts without special remark. Chrysostom notices that the citation corresponds in sentiment with Isaiah lii. 15.¹

The supposition that the passage was original in the primitive and apostolic liturgy would require the admission that, even in the days of St. Paul, the liturgy had been committed to writing. *Γέγραπται* must imply a written source. But no evidence has yet been produced to show that there were written liturgies in the first century. The words appear in the liturgies of *St. Mark* and *Greek St. James*, in all respects in the same way as do other quotations from the Bible. There is no difficulty in the supposition that the compilers quoted St. Paul: the contrary opinion involves many difficulties, and demands the assumption of positions not yet established. A third supposition, that the compilers and St. Paul both quoted Isaiah, and adapted his words in the same fashion, is clearly incredible.

On a review of the several arguments, we conclude that

¹ See, e.g., Jerome, *Ad Pammachium* (de opt. gen. inter.); Chrysostom, *On the Corinthians*, l.c.; Clement (Alex.), *Quis Dives sal.* xxiii., *et saepe*; Cyril (Jer.), *Catech.* vi. 6; Origen *ap. Tischend. N.T.*, l.c., and *In Ierem.* xviii.; Hegesippus *ap. Routh*, *Rel. Sacc.* i. 219; Clement (Rom.), *Ad Cor.* i. 34, ed. Wotton, p. 144 and n.; and cf. *Poli Synop. Critt.* v. 351.

there is no evidence to justify our attributing the quotation in 1 Corinthians ii. 9 to any other source than the Old Testament. It is taken primarily from Isaiah lxiv. 4, but with a reminiscence of lxv. 16—two Septuagintal texts combined and adapted in the manner freely employed by the writers of the New Testament. The quotation is not made to establish a doctrine, but only for illustration. The apostle asserts that his words are in harmony with ancient utterances recorded in Holy Writ; and an allusion to two passages, each being part of a context which speaks of the coming blessedness that is to succeed the departing tribulation, is enough for his purpose. The phraseology is varied, but the meaning agrees with the sentiments of the prophet whom the Church has always known as the son of Amoz, but who is to the higher criticism only a vague and shadowy being, the "Great Unnamed."

It follows therefore that in the *Greek St. James* the words which are also found in 1 Corinthians ii. 9 are quoted from St. Paul; and if the most decisive of the supposed quotations turns out after all to be not derived from a liturgical source, it would be unreasonable to construct a theory of the antiquity of the primitive rites by the evidence of the other resemblances which have been already pointed out; for it would be difficult to refute the contention that they are quotations from New Testament writings made like others which are indubitably taken from the Old. And yet, as before suggested, the apostolic phrases and sentiments in the oldest parts of the earliest liturgies may be more directly derived than even by literal quotation from written documents. Where historical evidence fails, internal evidence will necessarily influence the conclusion. No Ritualist will imagine that the primitive rites need factitious arguments and unsupported assertions to enhance their claims as the earliest forms of Divine service. Ritualists will agree that, though St. Paul did not quote from one

of them in writing to the Corinthians, they still declare their antiquity by unimpeachable credentials. The arrangement, the sentiments, still more the very phraseology, all which are the common heritage of different Churches, can only have had their origin in the days of a Christendom which was still united both by adherence to a common faith and also by that constant intercommunion which ceased to be practicable when the territory of Christendom was extended. Rubrical directions which have long grown obsolete are the productions of a far off age. The prayers, which often allude to conditions only found in the earliest times of Christianity, are replete with thoughts and phrases that breathe the very spirit of the Apostles themselves. But to maintain the antiquity of a particular office, on the ground of a supposed quotation from it in an epistle which is admitted to be a genuine writing of the first century, is to support a true position by an untenable argument.

G. H. GWILLIAM.

A SURVEY OF THE SYNOPTIC QUESTION.

V. NEW HYPOTHESES (*continued*).

WE have as yet done little more than cross the threshold of the treasure-house into which we are conducted by Dr. Resch. Something has been said very inadequately of his attempt, which runs parallel to Prof. Marshall's, to get back to an Aramaic original lying behind the various Greek versions of evangelical sayings current in the early centuries. This however, though of course an important feature in his book, is hardly that which is most distinctive about it. Mr. Marshall operates chiefly with the canonical text; it is characteristic of Dr. Resch that he takes a wider range. His present work, it must be remembered, is only an instalment. It is to be followed by another, dealing in like manner with extra-canonical sayings.¹ When the two books are complete, they will form an enormous repertory of sayings rightly or wrongly attributed to Christ. It is not surprising that these researches should have occupied, as we are told, five and twenty years. We are reminded in some measure of the thirty years spent by the Cambridge editors over the monumental work which appeared about the same time as the Revised Version of the New Testament. Dr. Resch too has a most substantial result to show for his labours. They bear the marks of prolonged study, as well as of diligence in collecting. The work which he now offers to the world, although it has evidently grown under his hand, is thoroughly *digested* work. Unlike much which issues from the German press, it is arranged with admirable clearness and method. The

¹ The title which it is to bear is *Extra-canonical Parallels to the Gospels*. See the "Selbstanzeige" in *Theol. Literaturblatt*, 1889, col. 369 ff.

passages are brought together in such a way that I should expect the book to be of considerable use even to a reader who was not acquainted with German. New devices of printing are tried—perhaps to an excess—in the shape of different kinds of underlining, the object of which is to enable the reader to catch the salient points more readily. And the notes on the collected passages present combinations which, although often, as I cannot but think, questionable, are also not seldom such as could only come from prolonged study in view of a dominant idea. The idea is naturally at times too dominant, and the author too sanguine as to the correctness of his own results; but that is only one aspect of the enthusiasm which has carried him through a task which must have been wearisome in proportion to its magnitude.

I will endeavour to state summarily the conclusions at which Dr. Resch arrives; I will then quote a few of what seem to me characteristic specimens of his method and of the kind of evidence which he adduces; and, lastly, I will give some account of the work which I mentioned at the outset of these papers by a younger scholar, Bousset, who has applied principles similar to those of Dr. Resch to the examination in particular of the writings of Justin Martyr.

We have seen that Dr. Resch starts from the “Two-Document” hypothesis. He too believes in the Petrine Memoirs and the Matthæan *Logia*. With the former of these two documents he does not deal directly. He gives it however to be understood that he does not regard it as identical with our present St. Mark. He takes that indeed to be the oldest of the canonical Gospels, but he treats it as, at the same time, a composite work made up from the *Logia* as well as the Petrine Notes; and he is prepared to go further than even Dr. Weiss himself in the extent to which he believes that the substance of the *Logia* has

entered into the composition of the Gospel. The wider question he does not pursue beyond this point. The main object of his book is to contribute to the history of the *Logia*.

This work of the Apostle St. Matthew is of course regarded as having been originally written in Hebrew. The Hebrew text however, as Papias says, found many translators. These different versions circulated to a greater or less extent; and although it was only natural that those adopted in our canonical Gospels should hold the field, still the others were not entirely suppressed. Traces of these, Dr. Resch thinks, may be found in the New Testament itself. To no less than thirty-eight distinct sayings he finds parallels or allusions in St. Paul, to seven in St. Peter, five in St. James, seven in the Apocalypse, and three in the Acts.¹ I imagine that this is in all probability the most doubtful portion of the book; and the lists will in any case need considerable reduction. Passing on to the patristic literature, we come to that vast collection of material which has been already mentioned. As to the history of these quotations and allusions Dr. Resch observes greater caution. He will not say that they are all taken directly from the original *Logia*; but I gather that he is prepared to affirm this direct dependence of the final editor of the *Apostolic Constitutions*, whom he identifies with the editor of the forged *Ignatian Letters*; and he also believes it to be probable in the case of some of the earliest Christian writings; in other works and in the various readings of certain authorities, notably Codex Bezae, he sees at least the influence of the oldest form of the *Logia*.

Before going on to this second and, on the whole, weightier part of Dr. Resch's researches, let me first give an example or two of the part relating specially to St. Paul. One of the strongest arguments in favour of St. Paul's use

¹ These are his own estimation in *Theol. Literaturblatt*, 1889, col. 371.

of a written Gospel seems to me to be that which turns on 1 Corinthians xi. 18, 19. In speaking of the disorders at the *agapæ*, St. Paul says: "I hear that there are divisions (*σχίσματα*) among you; and in part I believe it. For there must be also factions (heresies, *αἱρέσεις*) among you, that they which are approved may be made manifest among you." Why must there be these *σχίσματα* and *αἱρέσεις*? Dr. Resch would say because of a distinct prediction to that effect by the Lord. He quotes four patristic parallels, of which two expressly and the third perhaps probably, refer to such a prediction. The first is from Justin, *Against Trypho*, c. xxxv.: "For He said, Many shall come in My name, clad without in sheep-skins, but within they are ravening wolves; and, There shall be *σχίσματα καὶ αἱρέσεις*." The next is from a work of which Dr. Resch, for the first time, makes considerable use—the so called *Didascalia*, published by Bunsen in the *Analecta Antenicæna*, with a reconstruction of the original Greek by De Lagarde. This work, which dates from the latter half of the third century, has, "as, also our Lord and Saviour said, There shall be heresies and schisms." And further, a quotation in the *Clementine Homilies* contains at least one, if not both, of these words: "For there shall be, as the Lord said, false apostles, false prophets, *αἱρέσεις, φιλαρχίαι*." Dr. Resch recognises *σχίσματα* behind *φιλαρχίαι*. He thinks that they are only different renderings of the same word in Aramaic. In any case, I think it is proved that the saying was current as a saying of Christ, and also that it was referred to by St. Paul. The points for which the proof would be less cogent would be (1) that it came from a written Gospel; (2) that that Gospel was the *Logia*, or one of the foundation documents of our present Gospels.

For another of these floating sayings, "Whereinsoever I shall find you, therein will I judge you," Dr. Resch quotes

sixteen examples from the most varied sources. And one of these, it is true, Justin, *Against Trypho*, c. xlvii., expressly attributes it to our Lord. But the *Vita S. Antonii*, (at the end of the fourth century) as expressly refers it to the prophet Ezekiel; and Elias Cretensis (in the eighth century) also quotes it as spoken by one of the prophets. I therefore think it more probable that it was taken originally from some apocryphal work which bore the name of Ezekiel, and that Justin refers it to Christ by a slip of memory, aided by the tendency which was already in force to give a specifically Christian interpretation to all parts alike of the Old Testament. But in any case it seems to me forced to find, as Dr. Resch does, any reference to the saying in St. Paul—either in 1 Thessalonians v. 4 or in Philippians iii. 12, where the only possible connexion lies through the single word *καταλαβεῖν*. Here and elsewhere Dr. Resch has found mystical meanings and references in St. Paul that I cannot believe to be tenable.

Widest spread of all the traditional sayings ascribed to our Lord is that well known one, Show yourselves approved money-changers (*γίνεσθε τραπεζίται δόκιμοι*). On this Dr. Resch has surpassed himself. He has collected no less than sixty-nine examples of its occurrence in patristic writings: and these examples are classified in such a way as to represent with great clearness what he conceives to have been the history of the saying.

The patristic applications of it bring out clearly the sense in which it was understood by the early Church. It was not taken as having any connexion with the parable of the talents; the idea attached to it is not that of *banking*, or the payment of interest upon capital, but simply that of *money-changing* and the testing of coin as bad or good. There is thus a natural point of contact with a passage like 1 Thessalonians v. 21, 22, "Prove all things; hold fast that which is good; abstain from

every appearance or form of evil" (ἀπὸ παντὸς εἶδους¹ πονηροῦ ἀπέχεσθε); and this, or language equivalent to it, is constantly quoted in connexion with γίνεσθε τραπεζίται δόκιμοι. Dr. Resch thinks that they were originally a single saying, spoken by our Lord Himself in Aramaic, and that St. Paul is quoting the latter part of the saying; while other divergent forms of it are due to varieties of rendering from the Hebrew. The proof of this series of propositions I confess seems to me imperfect. It is true that the sayings are combined, not quite certainly by Clement of Alexandria, but clearly by Pamphilus in his Apology for Origen, by Cyril of Jerusalem, several times by St. Basil, and in the homily on St. Matthew attributed to St. Athanasias; but in the two places quoted from Origen there is a distinct though slight break between the sayings. It is true also that the saying, "Show yourselves approved money-changers," is referred expressly to our Lord, if not by Origen, yet by the *Clementine Homilies*, the anonymous *Vita S. Syncretica*, Jerome, and Socrates; but there is no clear proof that it came from the *Logia*, and no direct evidence that the Pauline phrases had the same origin. It seems to me quite as probable that this language of St. Paul was used by some early writer to explain the other saying; and that the two came to adhere together, and were quoted by later writers as a single saying. The early writer in question may have been either Clement or Origen. But the force of association is very strong: when two passages fit together so easily and naturally as these do, a little impulse only would be required to fuse them in common speech.

There is one important factor on the whole of this

¹ Dr. Resch quotes from Hesychius (εἶδος νομισματος) in proof that εἶδος meant specially "a kind of coin." The Latin rendering is *species*, from which we get our "specie"; but I am not sure that the process by which this use is arrived at is really parallel.

group of questions which I do not think that Dr. Resch has borne sufficiently in mind ; that is, the influence which one writer exercised upon another, and the extent to which some particular form of quotation may have been simply passed on from hand to hand. It will not be necessary to remind the reader to what an extent the ancients were in the habit of writing out the words of their predecessors with acknowledgment or, far more often, without it. This applies in particular to the repeating of the same quotations.

I have in my mind an instance where this practice of theirs is of considerable importance. One of the most marked among the early quotations from the Gospels is a passage in the epistle of Clement of Rome to the Corinthians, which appears to be taken from the Sermon on the Mount. I am glad now, on looking back to my book, *The Gospels in the Second Century*, p. 62 ff., to see that I treated this passage with a good deal of reserve. Perhaps I may be allowed to quote the whole of this discussion, defective as it is in one important particular, partly because I think it will appear that the caution which I then observed has been justified, and partly as an example of the way in which the bringing in of new evidence is apt to alter the balance of reasoning. The passage discussed is also in more ways than one typical.

MATT. v. 7 ; vi. 14 ; vii. 12, 2.	CLEM. ROM., <i>Ad Cor.</i> , c. xiii.	LUKE vi. 36, 37, 31, 38, 37, 38.
--------------------------------------	--	-------------------------------------

[Especially remembering the word of the Lord Jesus which He spake ; . . . for thus He said :]

v. 7. Blessed are the pitiful : for they shall be pitied.	Pity ye, that ye may be pitied :	vi. 36. Be ye merciful, etc.
---	----------------------------------	------------------------------

MATT. v. 7; vi. 14; vii. 12, 2.

vi. 14. For if ye forgive men their trespasses, etc.

vii. 12. All things therefore whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, even so do ye unto them.

vii. 2. For with what judgment ye judge, ye shall be judged:

and with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured unto you.

CLEM. ROM. *Ad Cor.*, c. xiii.

forgive, that it may be forgiven unto you.

As ye do, so shall it be done unto you:

as ye give, so shall it be given unto you:

as ye judge, so shall it be judged unto you: as ye are kind, so shall kindness be shown unto you:

with what measure ye mete, with it shall it be measured unto you.

LUKE vi. 36, 37, 31, 38, 37, 38.

vi. 37. Acquit, and ye shall be acquitted.

vi. 31. And as ye would that they should do unto you, do ye also unto them likewise.

vi. 38. Give, and it shall be given unto you.

vi. 37. And judge not, and ye shall not be judged.

vi. 38. For with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured unto you again.

v. 7. μακάριοι οἱ ἐλεήμονες· ὅτι αὐτοὶ ἐλεηθήσονται.

vi. 14. εἰὰν γὰρ ἀφῆτε τοῖς ἀνθ. τὰ παραπτώματα αὐτῶν.

vii. 12. πάντα οὖν ὅσα εἰὰν θέλητε ἵνα ποιῶσιν ὑμῖν οἱ ἀνθ. οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς ποιεῖτε αὐτοῖς.

vii. 2. ἐν ᾧ γὰρ κρίματι κρίνετε κριθήσεσθε,

καὶ ἐν ᾧ μέτρῳ μετρεῖτε μετρηθήσεται ὑμῖν.

ἐλεεῖτε, ἵνα ἐλεηθῆτε.

ἀφίετε ἵνα ἀφεθῇ ὑμῖν.

ὡς ποιεῖτε, οὕτως ποιηθήσεται ὑμῖν.

ὡς δίδετε οὕτως δοθήσεται ὑμῖν.

ὡς κρίνετε οὕτως κριθήσεται ὑμῖν· ὡς χρηστεύσεσθε, οὕτως χρηστευθήσεται ὑμῖν· ᾧ μέτρῳ μετρεῖτε μετρηθήσεται ὑμῖν.

vi. 36. γίνεσθε οἰκτίρμονες, κ.τ.λ.

vi. 37. ἀπολύετε, καὶ ἀπολυθήσεσθε.

vi. 31. καὶ καθὼς θέλετε ἵνα ποιῶσιν ὑμῖν οἱ ἀνθ., καὶ ὑμεῖς ποιεῖτε αὐτοῖς ὁμοίως.

vi. 38. δίδετε, καὶ δοθήσεται ὑμῖν.

vi. 37. καὶ μὴ κρίνετε, καὶ οὐ μὴ κριθῆτε.

vi. 38. τῷ γὰρ αὐτῷ μέτρῳ ᾧ μετρεῖτε ἀντιμετρηθήσεται ὑμῖν.

“We are to determine whether this quotation was taken from the canonical Gospels. Let us try to balance the arguments on both sides as fairly as possible. Dr. Lightfoot writes in his note upon the passage as follows: ‘As Clement’s quotations are often very loose, we need not go beyond the canonical Gospels for the source of this passage. The resemblance to the original is much closer here than it is, for instance, in his account of Rahab above, § 12. The hypothesis therefore that Clement derived the saying from oral tradition, or from some lost Gospel, is not needed.’ (1) No doubt it is true that Clement does often quote loosely. The difference of language, taking the parallel clauses one by one, is not greater than would be found in many of his quotations from the Old Testament. (2) Supposing that the order of St. Luke is followed, there will be no greater dislocation than, *e.g.*, in the quotation from Deuteronomy ix. 12-14 and Exodus xxxii. (7, 8), 11, 31, 32, in c. liii; and the backward order of the quotation would have a parallel in *Clem. Hom.* xvi. 13, where the verses Deuteronomy xiii. 1-3, 5, 9 are quoted in the order Deuteronomy xiii. 1-3, 9, 5, 3, and elsewhere. The composition of a passage from different places in the same book, or more often from places in different books, such as would be the case if Clement was following Matthew, frequently occurs in his quotations from the Old Testament. (3) We have no positive evidence of the presence of this passage in any non-extant Gospel. (4) Arguments from the manner of quoting the Old Testament to the manner of quoting the New must always be to a certain extent *a fortiori*, for it is undeniable that the New Testament did not as yet stand upon the same footing of respect and authority as the Old, and the scarcity of MSS. must have made it less accessible. In the case of converts from Judaism, the Old Testament would have been largely committed to [memory in youth, while the knowledge of the New would be only recently acquired. These considerations seem to favour the hypothesis that Clement is quoting from our Gospels.

“But, on the other hand, it may be urged, (1) That the parallel adduced by Dr. Lightfoot, the story of Rahab, is not quite in point, because it is narrative, and narrative, both in Clement and the other writers of his time, is dealt with more freely than discourse. (2) The passage before us is also of greater length than is usual in Clement’s free quotations. I doubt whether as long a piece of discourse can be found treated with equal freedom, unless it is the two doubtful cases in c. viii. and c. xxix. (3) It will not fail to be noticed that the passage, as it stands in Clement, has a roundness, a compactness, a balance of style, which give it an individual and independent appearance.

“Fusions effected by an unconscious process of thought are, it is true, sometimes marked by this completeness; still there is a difficulty in

supposing the terse antitheses of the Clementine version to be derived from the fuller, but more lax and disconnected, sayings in our Gospels. (4) It is noticed in *Supernatural Religion* that the particular phrase *χρηστεύεσθε* has at least a partial parallel in Justin (*γίνεσθε χρῆστοὶ καὶ οἰκτίρμονες*), though it has none in the canonical Gospels. This may seem to point to a documentary source no longer extant.

“Doubtless light would be thrown upon the question if we only knew what was the common original of the two Synoptic texts. How do they come to be so like and yet so different as they are? How do they come to be so strangely broken up?¹ etc.

The omission in this argument is that it failed to take account of the patristic parallels. Dr. Lightfoot noticed one of these in his first edition only to dismiss it. In his recent edition he adds three more references. His present note runs thus :

“Polycarp, indeed (*Phil.* 2), in much the same words, quotes our Lord as saying *ἀφίετε, καὶ ἀφεθήσεται ὑμῖν : ἐλεείτε, ἵνα ἐλεηθῆτε* ; but it can hardly be doubted, from his manner of introducing the quotation (*μνημονεύοντες ὧν εἶπεν ὁ Κύριος διδάσκων*), that he had this passage of Clement in his mind, and does not quote independently. See also *Clem. Alex. Strom.* ii. 18 (p. 476) *ἐλεᾶτε, φησὶν ὁ Κύριος, κ.τ.λ.*, where it is quoted almost exactly as here, except that *ἐν αὐτῷ* is omitted. He betrays no misgiving that he is not quoting directly from the Gospel, when evidently he has taken the words from his namesake the Roman Clement. *Comp. Apost. Const.* ii. 21 ; *Ps.-Ign., Trall.* 8.”

Dr. Resch quotes eight examples of the whole or part of the passage. He does not refer at all to the possibility that the later writers may be copying the earlier, but he assumes that all are quoting from a lost text. I confess that in the main I believe him to be right. It is true that the coincidence of phrase with which Polycarp introduces the quotation raises a suspicion that the Roman Clement exercised an influence upon him. It is true also that the Alexandrine Clement was very familiar with the epistle of his Roman namesake, and makes free use of it ; and further, it is true that in one place the citation of his pre-

¹ *The Gospels in the Second Century* (1876), p. 63 ff.

decessor is evidently made from memory, as he refers the passage erroneously to Barnabas. Still I do not think that there is any proof that he had his predecessor in mind in the near context of this quotation; and we should have to believe, not only that he knew his work, but that he knew it better than St. Matthew and St. Luke. That he might conceivably do; but every additional parallel, and every new author brought into the comparison, increases the probability that there is some common text now lost lying behind them. My impression is that none of all Dr. Resch's instances is better for his purpose than this. The passage, as it stands in the two Clements, has every appearance of being original.

Another curious and interesting passage is spread over six quotations in as many writers. In its fullest form it runs thus: "The Lord also said that he who gives is more blessed than he who receives. For woe to those who possess and receive by hypocrisy (*ἐν ὑποκρίσει λαμβανόντων* = I suppose, as we might say, "obtains by false pretences"), or are able to help themselves, and desire to receive from others; for each shall give account to the Lord God in the day of judgment." Not quite all the places where the whole or part of this is quoted are likely to be independent of each other. The oldest (partial) quotation is in the *Didaché*; and Hermas also has it, not on this occasion borrowing from the *Didaché*, because he quotes rather more than the *Didaché* does. It is quoted besides in a fragment attributed to Clement of Alexandria, in the *Didascalía*, the *Apostolic Constitutions*, and Anastasius Sinaita.

The first portion of the saying is quoted in Acts xx. 35. From the citation in the *Apostolic Constitutions* it would seem that there was some interval between the two parts; but this was probably slight. It will be observed that the balance of "blessing" and "woe" goes to confirm the historical character of St. Luke's form of the Beatitudes.

The negative version of the Christian precept, "Do to others as ye would they should do unto you," is another widely diffused saying. Dr. Resch gives eleven examples of it, several of them not independent. These again begin with the *Didaché*, and they include the spurious addition to Acts xv. 20 and 29. The different expressions used rather suggest translation.

ὅσα ἂν μὴ βούληται ἄνθρωπος ἑαυτῷ γίνεσθαι.
 ὅσα ἐὰν θελήσῃς μὴ γίνεσθαί σοι.
 ὅσα μὴ θέλεις σοὶ γενέσθαι
 ὃ σὺ δὲ μισεῖς ὑφ' ἑτέρου σοι γένεσθαι.

This last form however recalls a parallel in Tobit iv. 15 (16), καὶ ὁ μισεῖς μηδεὶν ποιήσεις; and the possibility is not remote that this and the positive form of the saying in Luke vi. 31 may have together given rise to the corresponding negative form.

Before leaving Dr. Resch, of whose work I have only given a few more or less characteristic examples, I ought perhaps to refer to one instance in which he believes that the original *Logia* are quoted, not only in fact, but by name. The false Ignatius (*Ad Magn.* 9) has the following:

ὁ μὴ ἐργαζόμενος γὰρ μὴ ἐσθιέτω ἐν ἰδρώτι γὰρ τοῦ προσώπου σου
 φάγη τὸν ἄρτον σου φασὶ τὰ λόγια.

Dr. Resch allows indeed that the latter half of the quotation comes from Genesis iii. 19; still he gives reasons for thinking that ὁ μὴ ἐργαζόμενος, κ.τ.λ., is a real *logion* of the Lord. Unfortunately the same phrase, φασὶ τὰ λόγια, occurs elsewhere in the same writer (*Smymn.* 3), where the quotation is evidently taken from Acts i. 11; so that in both places we ought apparently to take λόγια in the wider sense of "the Scriptures."

I have hardly left myself space to deal at any length with Herr Bousset. He is an independent follower in the steps

of Dr. Resch, rather deficient in clearness of style and exposition,¹ but otherwise well equipped for his task. His inquiry is devoted specially to the quotations which appear to be taken from a Gospel or Gospels in Justin Martyr. He does not question the use of our Synoptics; indeed he strengthens the arguments which have been urged in proof of such use by pointing out that Justin must have had before him the Sermon on the Mount in the form in which it now stands in our St. Matthew. But he thinks that, besides our present Gospel, Justin had access to some other document essentially of the Synoptic type, but where it differs from them showing signs of still greater originality and value. When he asks himself what that document is, we cannot be surprised that he should answer, the *Logia* of St. Matthew referred to by Papias. He thinks that while our Synoptics were read and occasionally copied by Justin, this still more ancient document clung to his memory and deeply influenced the form of his quotations.

If I may sum up rather abruptly, the state of the case in regard to Justin seems to me to be something like this. He constantly used, and largely used, our three Synoptic Gospels. I believe that he also used the fourth Gospel, but that does not now concern us. And yet by the side of this use of the Synoptics there is, I think it must be admitted, an unknown element, which cannot be wholly accounted for by mere freedom of quotation. The question then is, Where does this unknown element come from? As a preliminary question, Is it single? Is it homogeneous? If it is, then I am afraid that we could not adopt Herr Bousset's conclusion. For I should be more clear that some of the features in Justin's quotations are secondary than that others are primary. Most of us would

¹ This seems to me conspicuously the case in the first paragraph on p. 93. I quite fail to understand what Herr Bousset regards as the true history of the passage in question.

gladly enough, I doubt not, gather up and treasure all that we have of the fragments of a Gospel older even than our own. I do not deny that there may be such fragments embedded in the works of Justin; and Dr. Resch and Herr Bousset have done much to help us to find them. But it is impossible to include in the number such traits as the cave of the nativity, the fire on the Jordan at the baptism, and a number of various readings, which, however early attested, are probably in most cases, and can be almost demonstrated in some, not to be genuine. By the time that Justin wrote, a good deal of corruption had made its way into the canonical text; and one branch of these corrupting influences he had not escaped.

There remains yet another hypothesis which the student of Justin's quotations ought, I think, to test very closely. Repeatedly we are struck by the way in which Justin appears to combine the texts of more than one of our present evangelists. Conceivably he may be quoting an original from which all of them are derived. But the other alternative must also be borne in mind, that he had before him a harmony, in which this process of combination had been already carried out. When I wrote on Justin, some sixteen years ago, I added a note at the end of the chapter to the effect that, on looking back over it, I was inclined to lean more than I did to the hypothesis that Justin used a harmony. I then thought that the "phenomena of variation" seemed "to be too persistent and too evenly distributed to allow of the supposition of alternate quoting from different Gospels."¹ Since that time I am afraid that the question has lain on the shelf so far as I am concerned. But only within the last week I have come across two striking coincidences, which might almost be called confirmations of the idea. The first is a review of Bousset by Schürer in the *Theol. Literaturzeitung* for Feb. 7th. He

¹ *The Gospels in the Second Century*, p. 136.

does not say in so many words that Justin used a harmony, but he expresses the opinion that all the divergences in the Sermon on the Mount may be explained by a fusion of the texts of St. Matthew and St. Luke; and he goes on further to call attention to the points of contact between Tatian's *Diatessaron* and Justin, and he urges the argument that, if the peculiarities in the text of Tatian certainly rest upon the foundation of our four Gospels, the same may be true of Justin—the peculiarities in his text too are more likely to be *posterior* to our Gospels than derived from a document anterior to them. These seem to me to be weighty considerations.

The second coincidence is with that acute scholar and indefatigable worker, Prof. Rendel Harris, who, in his recent treatise on the *Diatessaron of Tatian*, argues independently of Justin that there must have been a harmony of the four Gospels earlier than Tatian's. He bases this inference upon a remarkable group of readings, called by Westcott and Hort "Western Non-Interpolations," all but one of which are found in the last chapter of St. Luke. The point is, that these readings hang together and were probably all introduced at the same time; that they probably had their origin in a harmony, but that traces of them are already found in the text out of which Tatian constructed his *Diatessaron*. The proof that they were in the *Diatessaron* turns especially upon the coincidence of the Curetonian Syriac and the Arabic version of the *Diatessaron* in the two readings where both are extant. There are however some gaps in the extension of the inference from these, and the proof as a whole does not seem to me altogether stringent.

But whether or not any one of the many hypotheses which are floating about is finally established, enough will have been said to show how deeply interesting is the stage which these inquiries have now reached. The horizon has

widened. The scene is in part shifted from the first century to the second. And I myself believe strongly in the method of working backwards from ascertained facts in the early history of the text to the circumstances of its origin. It is probably in these outlying regions that a conclusion will first be reached. But there is a stage in most inquiries where, the key once found for a portion of the problem, brings with it rapidly the solution of other portions, and so a way is made gradually towards the centre. I quite admit that the present problem is still surrounded by difficulties, many and serious, but the removal of them may be nearer than we suppose.

W. SANDAY.

HABAKKUK.¹

OUR subject is the prophecy of Habakkuk. Very little is known about the writer of this prophecy. The title of the book is short, and does not tell us who his father was, or where he was born; it does not tell us even when he lived and worked. It runs: "The burden which Habakkuk the prophet did see." The name is unusual; nobody else in the Bible bears it. It is supposed to be derived from a Hebrew verb, which means "to embrace"; and ingenious scholars have tried to find some significance in the man's name. Indeed, there are commentators and critics who think that it is not a proper name at all, but an appellation devised by later editors to indicate the book and the form of it, and therefore that it specifies the character of the book. If the right word is the verb meaning "to embrace," then the name may mean "a man embraced by God," a man specially favoured, made His confidential friend by God. That would be the likeliest interpretation. Another suggestion is "the man who embraces God"; *i.e.* wrestles with Him, struggles to find out God's meaning in the actual course of events. A third suggestion concerning the interpretation of the name is that this prophet's special function among his own people was to comfort them, and undoubtedly that is much the best way of indicating the special character of this prophet, *viz.* "the comforter"; for it is a prophecy of the most extraordinary and pathetic comfort. In a book of Luther we read: "What Habakkuk does in his prayer is to caress his people and take them in his arms; *i.e.* he comforts and cheers them as one caresses a poor, weeping child or fellow creature that it may be hushed and contented, because it shall soon, if God will, be better." Really, that homely

¹ A lecture.

passage puts you in possession of the key-note of Habakkuk's message to his time.

There are a great many ridiculous legends about the man in the old Jewish rabbis and the early Christian Fathers. They know, for instance, that he carried, in a supernatural way, food to Daniel in the lions' den; and they tell us where his birthplace was, and other things of the kind. One idea is that he was a Levite, and had to do with the musical service in the temple, because his book ends with a hymn that is set to music, as he speaks of "my stringed instruments." And because reference is made to "*my* stringed instruments," people emphasize the word "my," and think that Habakkuk himself played some musical instrument, a strange instrument, in the temple choir. I do not see that at all. I am very dubious whether "my" should be there: it is probably the plural, instead of the singular. We even have to guess the date of Habakkuk's book, the period when he lived and exercised his prophetic office.

Jerusalem is the metropolis that interested him. He is a prophet of the Southern kingdom, the kingdom of Judæa. The dates suggested from the prophecy vary between 650 B.C. and fifteen years into the next century. But we may shut out all the extremer dates. Practically the question lies between the years 630 and 600 B.C. The outstanding thing in the prophecy that guides us to the era when it was produced is the fact that Assyria has disappeared. In the earliest prophets of the eighth century and the opening years of the seventh century, the great, stupendous empire of Nineveh is the world-power that confronts Israel and Israel's prophets. Now it is no longer Nineveh; it is the mighty empire of Babylon.

Moreover, I think the characteristic thought and emotion of the prophecy are best explained, if we suppose Habakkuk to have lived just at the time when the tremendous and

imposing transfer of the world's sovereignty took place, the empire of the nations passing from the great city on the Tigris to the still more mighty metropolis on the river Euphrates. An event of that kind would stir the minds of men everywhere, but supremely it would raise up conflicting emotions in the breast of a devout Hebrew prophet. I am not, however, going to discuss the question of date, because there are far more important subjects to consider.

The two likeliest points where the prophecy may have been produced are these: During Josiah's struggle to establish a religious reform; then it would be between the years 630 B.C. and 626. Or, again, just at the time when Nineveh was destroyed and Babylon began to show the tremendous powers it held for the conquest of the world. That would make the prophecy somewhere between 608 and 600 B.C.; more likely near the latter date. One thing may be taken as tending to show that Habakkuk prophesied before Babylon had displayed its immense resources and military might, and that is in the opening passage in the first chapter, where the Chaldeans are spoken of as if they were a new phenomenon in the world's history.

My own strong conviction is that Habakkuk wrote his book about the year 600; *i.e.* between 605 and 600 B.C.

Now, first of all, let me put you in possession of the historical situation. When studying Hosea and Joel, we were in the eighth century, and in the Northern kingdom of Ephraim. Now we come down to the seventh century, and stand in the kingdom of Judah. The Northern kingdom has been swept out of existence by the empire whose seat was at Nineveh. The Southern kingdom had a comparatively prosperous period during the reign of Hezekiah, and a pure religion thrived under that good and benevolent monarch. His reign came to an end just at the beginning of the century. He was succeeded by Manasseh. During Manasseh's reign Judæa suffered a great many disasters,

and was constantly buffeted by the Assyrian empire. Moreover, Manasseh was a bad king. His sympathies lay with paganism. The religion of Jehovah was corrupted during that king's rule. Amon followed, and he was succeeded by a good king, Josiah, who reigned about 639 on to 608. Josiah began as a young monarch. He was confronted by the ruling classes of his father's time. These were all on the side of idolatry—a corrupt, depraved, and sensualized worship of Jehovah. Moreover, under the bad, loose, tyrannical reign of Manasseh, all sorts of abuses had been introduced; law had been perverted, justice tainted; oppression reigned everywhere; poverty increased, violence and anarchy spread. The young king gradually got the reins into his own hand. He was backed up by one grand prophet, Jeremiah, and there were other noble statesmen, priests, and prophets supporting him. Gradually he formed a party for justice, for righteousness, for religious reform. At length, after he had reigned some eighteen years, he was able to give effect to his own resolves. He crushed the opposite, heathenish party; he suppressed idolatrous worship; *i.e.* he decreed its suppression by law, and to a large extent accomplished it in fact.

Josiah had enforced the new *régime*, and carried it out to a great extent, and the succeeding portion of his rule was comparatively pure, and in a large degree prosperous. He began, in some measure, to recover the old power that used to be wielded by the great monarchs of the ancient time over the surrounding little states and nations.

I will carry the story a step farther, keeping to the internal history of Judæa. The Egyptian army undertook to force its way across Palestine, to strike at Assyria. Josiah imagined that good policy required him to resist the Egyptian advance, and so he went and barred the progress of Pharaoh-necho at Megiddo. It was most disastrous for him; he was wounded at the very onset, and carried

back to Jerusalem, where he died. On his death, all the good he had done crumbled to pieces. His successor, Jehoiachim, was a king of a totally different character from his father, being weak and wicked. Of course there had always been the old pagan party in opposition during the latter half of Josiah's reign, but naturally coveting their old position of privilege and power; and so it happened they got hold of the heir to the throne, and, on his ascending it, reasserted themselves. The religious reforms of Josiah were reversed; corruption, violence, and oppression recurred; and mercenary adventurers and unscrupulous men were put into possession of power. The kingdom went from worse to worse.

Now to a man who had lived through those years of religious improvement, of moral and social amelioration, of gradual renewal of external prosperity—to a Hebrew prophet who had thought this the dawn of the coming final victory for God's kingdom, you can understand how tremendous was the trial of faith, when all the bright promises of a new day were dashed by storm and tempest, and a darker night settled down on the country than ever before.

Now I come to external history. During the latter half of the seventh century the Assyrian empire had grown sick. A malady of weakness was spread through all its immense, gigantic frame. The central imperial grasp upon outlying provinces relaxed. The mighty empire was beginning to break up. And then, in the era of its decay, it was assailed by two formidable opponents, by the Persian power that had been growing up away in the Northern mountains, and again from the South by the rapidly increasing kingdom and state of Babylon. For a long time the old empire of Nineveh held out. It was a slow, protracted struggle. During, therefore, those closing decades of the seventh century the government of Nineveh had enough to do

simply to defend itself from its own antagonists, from Persia and Babylon. The consequence was that those Palestine states that used to be vassals of Assyria were able to reassert their independence; and, among them, Judæa, under king Josiah, woke up to dreams of its old proud expectations of recovering its freedom and re-establishing the kingdom of king David. But it was not merely the Palestinian states that felt the paralysis away at the centre of the old empire of Nineveh. Egypt, that had played a subordinate part all along to Assyria, woke up to dreams, not of freedom, but of ambition and aggrandisement. There was seated on the throne of Egypt at the time a man of very great ability, remarkable breadth of mind, and boldness of initiative, Pharaoh-necho. He reversed the policy of his predecessors. Instead of shutting up Egypt by itself, he threw it wide open to Greek civilization, science, enterprise, and commerce. He employed skilled Greek officers to remodel his Egyptian army. He enrolled in its ranks an immense number of "free lances," soldiers of fortune. He endeavoured to form powerful fleets, both on the Southern Sea (the Arabian Sea) and the Mediterranean. He actually conceived the magnificent idea of cutting a canal across the Isthmus of Suez, though not in the same direction as the modern canal; it was to run by the Nile, and then to strike across to the Red Sea. He began that enterprise, which was to enable him to concentrate his war fleet either in the Mediterranean or in the Arabian Sea, and he actually carried the work on to a great extent. There is almost absolute certainty that his ships, manned and officered by Greek sailors, circumnavigated Africa, sailed down the Red Sea and by the Cape of Good Hope, and returned through the Straits of Gibraltar.

Pharaoh-necho, feeling the incipient paralysis away at Nineveh, and perceiving the movements of the Palestinian states, determined to become their lord and master, and to

suck their blood in war tribute. He commenced to attack them, was very successful in his endeavours, and at last, about 609 B.C., resolved to carry his conquest right on to the Euphrates. Poor king Josiah tried to bar his way, and was crushed in the attempt. Pharaoh-necho reached the Euphrates, and arrived at Carchemish. In the meantime, Nineveh had succumbed to Persia and Babylon. Persia took all the provinces of Assyria that extended away in its own direction. Babylon received as its share the provinces on the way to the Mediterranean.

There was a tremendous battle, and Egypt was utterly annihilated about the year 605 or 604 B.C. Babylon, having discomfited Egypt, thus rolled on in a triumphal march, taking state after state, town after town, establishing its ascendancy over the old dominions of Nineveh. And, when Jehoiachim found himself confronted with this resistless power, he too succumbed, and became the vassal of Babylon. For years after that Babylon ruled the world, ruled it with a rod of iron; wielded a merciless, cruel, and rapacious sway over the conquered kingdoms; crushed the very life out of them, and so acquired for itself an almost supernatural, devilish, and demoniacal character. It is an extraordinary thing that throughout the Old, on into the New Testament, the standing name and symbol for antagonism to God and goodness, to truth and mercy and justice, the embodiment of all that is fiendish and iniquitous and wicked in the ungodly world, is Babylon—not Assyria, but Babylon. It is a curious thing that, in the very first Bible notice of that great city, the building of the Tower of Babel, the key-note was struck. That tower was built in defiance of God.

I will read you some poetry, which I find magnificently translated in a recent work on "The Book of Isaiah," by the Rev. George Adam Smith. It is a taunt-song or satiric ode, full of passion and powerful thought, written by a

Hebrew prophet, who exults over the expected downfall of Babylon. This is how it runs :

“ Ah! still is the tyrant,
 And stilled is the fury!
 Broke hath Jehovah the rod of the wicked,
 Sceptre of despots:
 Stroke of (the) peoples with passion,
 Stroke unremitting,
 Treading in wrath (the) nations,
 Trampling unceasing.
 Quiet, at rest, is the whole earth,
 They break into singing;
 Even the pines are jubilant for thee,
 Lebanon’s cedars!
 ‘ Since thou liest low, cometh not up
 Feller against us.’
 Sheol from under shuddereth at thee
 To meet thine arrival,
 Stirring up for thee the shades,
 All great-goats of earth!
 Lifteth erect from their thrones
 All kings of peoples.”

What tremendous passion, hatred, and satire there is in that!

I have shown you how the development of the internal history of Israel during that seventh century created a terrible problem for faith. Could the old promise be true? could Israel be God’s people, the germ of God’s kingdom? Then, again, the external history created a more perplexing problem. During those years when Assyria was crumbling into decay, it looked to the Hebrew prophet as if God were fulfilling His promise; now is the time for Judæa to reassert herself, to conquer Hebrew nations, and compel them to own the power of Jehovah. But, as Babylon came rolling on once more, there is the prospect of a long, dark, and unbroken night of degradation and subjection to pagan power. Could Israel be God’s people? could God be the living God, Jehovah?

This prophecy throws a very remarkable light upon the fashion in which a Hebrew prophet received his supernatural revelation. Nobody can read the book and help seeing that light from heaven did not flash upon a prophet externally or mechanically. God's Spirit dwelt with the man's spirit as God's Spirit dwells with your spirit and mine. Through pain and perplexity, through wrestling with the actual problems of life around him, through the use of his intellect, but infinitely more through the use of his conscience, and best of all through purity of heart guiding a soul made true to God's great purposes in this world, the Hebrew prophet received those Divine intuitions concerning the world's course and God's designs that mark out the Old Testament as a supernatural, inspired book.

Let us trace the stream, the growth of emotion and thought, in this prophecy. Habakkuk looks upon the utter destruction of Josiah's reforms; the downfall of pure religion; the return of idolatry, the very worst kind of idol worship; sensuality eating away the very fabric of social life; injustice, unrighteousness, tyranny, oppression, breaking up the commonwealth; and the questions confront him: "Is God holding His people in His hands? is God, through Israel, building up a kingdom here on earth? How can that be true when Israel has, on the one hand, sunk down into such sin and guilt; and, on the other, has been brought into such utter subjection to a heathen power?" God very often answers one difficulty by showing you another. To be so unexpectedly confronted with this awful perplexity to faith, Babylon's sudden rise and resistless march onward in its conquering course, would have meant despair, it may be, to a half-hearted man. A man that had not entered into the secret of God's government of this world through moral forces, through ethical and spiritual powers, not through mere physical, brute force, would have succumbed. He

would have said to himself, as the Moabite, the Philistine, and the Phœnician said, "There is no government of righteousness in this world. Force carries everything before it; our own gods are helpless before this tremendous Babylon; let us bow down before Babylon, and make the best terms we can; let us abandon all our patriotic hopes, all that was ideal, all that had a future, in the faith and aspirations of the nation." On the contrary, the Hebrew prophet looked at the unruly tide of pagan conquest, and said to himself: "That appalling instrument of penalty has been raised up by God; it is God's weapon of chastisement. This corrupt Israel never could fulfil God's design; and by terrible, bitter retribution, by degradation, by defeat, by humiliation, God will drive the people back to Himself."

Do you see the triumph of faith there was in that? But immediately a new problem for faith was created; for a just, good man, looking at the Babylonian empire, forecasting its course, detecting its character, could not reconcile himself to the idea that that was God's chosen minister of justice in the world. A Hebrew prophet had a very definite idea of what a divinely ordained king and kingdom and government, according to God's mind and will, ought to be. He had comprehended—and it is a grand thing in the Old Testament to find it there—the last secret of enlightened human philosophy and of political economy. He had comprehended that governments exist for the sake of the governed, not the governed for the governments. He had comprehended that power is put into men's hands, not for their own selfish aggrandisement, not for their own advantage or profit, but as a solemn trust. He had comprehended that every earthly rule is a part of the Divine administration, and has to be wielded according to the wishes of God. For the establishing of justice and righteousness, and the promoting of what is ethical, noble, and

elevated; not for ends that are low, degraded, and merely physical, however imposing such things may be made in their show of wealth, of wisdom, or of civilization. He had comprehended that God means by rule on earth to promote happiness, to promote the prosperity of the whole commonwealth, not of privileged classes, not of a few tyrants, not of the monarch himself. With that idea of a true kingdom in this world, that faith that this earth was made by God, that over this confused world of ours, dominating its history, there is the great Divine heart, pure, and just, and righteous, the prophet, when he looked at Babylon, said to himself: "Babylon cannot be God's kingdom; this Babylonian conquest of the world is not God's last utterance in the world's story, and therefore it must pass by; therefore it must be a mere episode in the world's history." And so he fell back upon an audacious certitude of faith. He says to himself, and to the small band of faithful men and women that know God and love righteousness: "Because God is righteous, and wishes to make the world a realm of holiness, justice, mercy, there—in that realm—is the empire of the future; and this Babylon must succumb before it." For Babylon was cruel and merciless beyond any empire that had gone before it. It went out of its way to crush, and destroy, and injure the peoples it conquered. It built up such a wealth, and fabric of luxury, and sensual indulgence in its mighty, magnificent metropolis, that it had to drain every blood-vessel of the conquered peoples in order to maintain its magnificence. It insulted all their national feelings; it outraged their religions. It was not content merely to crush revolt; it strove to make its domination as intolerable, as insulting, and as humiliating as it could contrive to do.

Here was the answer that came to the perplexed, doubting, agonizing heart of Habakkuk, as he wrestled with the enigma, as the darkness fell upon his heart, as the old faith

revived and rose up against it within him. Suddenly, a great light from heaven flashed through it all.

He saw a vision. The developments of time unrolled before him. He was able to forecast the story of that Colossus of the Euphrates, that mighty Babylonian empire, and to foresee the future of the kingdom of God that was buried in obscurity in Jerusalem. He said to himself, and then he said to his fellows, that the vision stretched over a long time; that hope might be protracted and delayed before it came, but come it must, for it rested on the reality of God: the God of righteousness, truth, and goodness.

This is what he saw. "God! not brute force, but God. The God that created this earth, the God that maintains, the God that rules it, the God whose purposes are sculpturing and carving out its destiny, is a God who, through and through, is a holy, just, magnificent, grand, generous, and merciful God. This God is a God spiritual; a God ethical; a God not of mere physical energy, not delighting in earthly magnificence, but finding a satisfaction to His Divine heart only in human character formed in His image: holy, just, pure, righteous, good. Therefore however long the issue may be in being decided, any man, any house, any nation, any world-empire that seeks only its own arrogant pride and ambition, its own cruel self-indulgence, its own earthly aggrandisement, at the cost of misery to mankind, of ruin and degradation to human character, is a defiance of God, an outrage on the Divine will, has against it all the eternal processes of God's government of the world, and therefore must succumb; while the little handful of faithful souls that have known God and have entered into fellowship with Him, that love what He loves, that choose what He chooses, that wish this world made conformable to His will; the just—however weak, impotent, bereft of all earthly resources, all military

might, all wealth, all imposing show of power—nevertheless shall survive and outlive heathen empires, if they persist in their faith. Not material power, not intellectual conviction of the truth of any creed or dogma; but actual fellowship with God, sympathy with Him, obedience to Him, being possessed of Him, the sense of belonging to Him on earth,—that is the faith which justifies to this day still.”

With this master-key to the history of nations, Habakkuk penetrated through the external show of imposing, resistless power in the Babylonian empire, and he detected the Divine emissaries of decay, ruin, and destruction that were beneath it and undermining it. The first thing that he recognised was this: Every forbidden appetite, every lawless, selfish passion carries in it the certainty of its own retribution, for this reason: because it is not regulated by God’s law, because it is a thing monstrous and unnatural, and therefore cannot be controlled; it masters the man who indulges it, like the thirst for strong drink, that the incipient drunkard never meant should be carried to such a dreadful extreme as to master property, health, home, life, everything. So Babylon’s unrestrained lust of wealth, greed of power, appetite for self-indulgence, would drive it on and on until it lost all power of estimating proportion, until it ran to an unbearable excess, until it made this earth such a hell to its vassals that at last, like the outraged debtors of a cruel, bloodthirsty moneylender, driven to desperation, they should rise and crush the tyrant. That is a law of political economy that has proved itself by experiment over and over again in this world’s story.

Moreover there is a strange, unavoidable retribution attached to ill-gotten gain. A man may coin it, a man may heap it up; but a man never can build up stable peoples on earth with it, he cannot erect an abiding home for ill-gotten gain. This great law the history of man has

writ large, and we see it in the terrible retribution and vengeance which have fallen on houses and nations.

Here is another great law of God's government of the world. Wherever the life of an individual or of a nation becomes predominantly materialistic, holds, as its highest goals and gains, mere luxury and pomp of life, triumphs of invention, of science, of commerce, of industry, of poetry, of painting, of art, of refinement; wherever a nation's life is engrossed in merely material ends; wherever a nation has ceased to represent, and embody, and make patent in the comity of the nations some ideal principle, some ethical end or aim—*e.g.* liberty, freedom, justice, mercy, virtue, religion,—God's wrath will fall on that nation: it will rot, it will decay; it is already a *soulless* body, and its earthly life will vanish out of it rapidly. That law applies to individual men, to houses and families, to states and empires.

You see the shame of it in the expressions used in the passage to this effect: "The Lord has ordered it, that what the heathen peoples build is for the fire, and what the nations toil for is to end in desolation, in destruction." Go to the books that tell you what that mighty Babylon was—wealthier, vaster, than London is now—and read that passage, that inspired intuition of the Divine law of the government of our world, of the certain decay and ruin of a civilization that has not within it a soul of ethical or spiritual potency, and beneficence for the good of the world around it; and then you will feel that the Old Testament is indeed inspired.

Another great moral lesson of history is that oppression ruins the character, not merely of the oppressed, but of the oppressors; *i.e.* any unjust, any tyrannical, any cruel exercise of power or rule in this world that spoils men's lives, that drives them to destitution or poverty, that robs them of their manhood. "Believe me," says Habakkuk,

“it is not merely the victims that are injured; the worst moral harm is done to those who have injured, *i.e.* the oppressors and the tyrants.” Take slavery: do you think it was merely the poor slaves that were degraded in their manhood? The mightiest argument against slavery is the moral contamination and corruption of the slaveholders. How can one man establish relations to his brother man, loved equally with him by God, that involve the destruction of the Divine image in that brother, without making himself a brute, a monster?

Then last, and most wonderful of all, the root of all moral and political wrong and blundering is false religion. How came Babylon, with such a chance of being the executant of God's purposes, and of making a kingdom of God in this world, to fling away its opportunity? How came it to pass that Babylon was so blind to all the divinely imposed laws and conditions of a permanent and an abiding government? Because Babylon's gods were such wretched, degraded, foul, sensual, tyrannical, lawless, unjust deities, that could not govern their subjects beneficently, justly. And so Habakkuk ends with his mocking at these dumb, blind idols, that could give no true political guidance or social wisdom to their worshippers. He then reaches the mountain-top of his own faith and certainty.

Now do you see how the whole thought of the book rises up and bursts out with a tremendous glory of exultant music in that majestic poem that pictures God's omnipotent, resistless sovereignty; God's glorious march through the world's story in the past; God's everlasting sovereignty still; God's truth, justice, mercy? Ah! the explanation of Babylon's first triumph is Israel's unworthiness. God loves His people, but He loves righteousness more; and therefore He will use that brutal tyrant Babylon to chastise His people, that He may have a people that will realize His kingdom on earth.

But, once again, the perplexity of the passing use of Babylon reaches its solution in the certain realization of the living reality, power, and rule of that God who cannot look on iniquity, who hates, who recoils from, oppression, cruelty, sin, and lust.

In that poem all the elements—the contending emotions, the doubts, the fears, the hopes, the longings of Habakkuk's spiritual experience and wrestling for faith—find their complete, perfect utterance, and their triumphant consummation, in a quiet trust, which will not be dismayed amid the clash and fall of nations and of empires; but which, when all the human props and supports of confidence have given way, can still rest peaceful and happy in the reality and being of God.

W. G. ELMSLIE.

THE SECRET AND THE REWARD OF
CONSTANCY.

“ Happy is the man who endureth temptation : for, when he is approved, he shall receive the crown of life, which He promised to them that love Him.”—
JAMES i. 12.

WHAT the function of evil is, and why it is permitted to exist, is a question which has perplexed the minds of men ever since they used discourse of reason. It is, confessedly, the most difficult of questions, and many, perhaps most, of the wise have given it up as, for the present at least, an insoluble problem. But the question, so difficult to us, seems to have presented no difficulty to the practical and uninquisitive intellect of St. James. He had solved it, at least to his own satisfaction ; and it may be doubtful whether even yet any better solution of it is to be reached. According to him, the function of evil is to *try* men, to test them, to put them to the proof, to show them what they are and what they ought to be. According to him, evil is permitted to exist, because out of evil and the miseries it breeds are woven these divers tribulations by which faith and patience are proved, and character is made entire and complete. And hence he would have us count it all joy when we fall into divers kinds of trials, adapted to the several elements and bents of our complex nature, and assures us that if we bear these trials with patience, and let patience have her perfect work in us, *we* shall at last become perfect and entire, lacking in nothing.

These trials, moreover, inasmuch as they will quicken in us a sense of our own weakness and folly, will lead us to God, the Source of all wisdom and strength ; feeling our lack of wisdom, we shall ask wisdom of Him, and it will be given unto us. But if we would ask so as to receive, we must ask in faith, nothing doubting ; and thus once more

our faith will be put to the proof and raised to a higher power.

Because trials bring us wisdom, and faith, and patience, we are not to shrink from them, but to glory in them, however *trying* they may be, and even though they seem to put that which is good in us to jeopardy. The rich man is to glory when he is tried by penury, and the poor man when he is tried by wealth, although, and because, these great reverses are such searching and decisive tests of character: for character is of infinitely greater worth than outward conditions, a man's life than the things which he possesseth.

Now, though in these counsels of perfection St. James rises high above the customs and habits of the world, he is nevertheless simply on a level with the thought and admiration of the world. For even the world can say, "The man who wants least is richer than the man who wants much." Even the world, although itself in such woeful haste to be rich, admires above all others men—such as George Washington, for example—who, unspoiled by their elevation to power and fame, have cheerfully retired into obscurity when their services were no longer required, and have put from them boundless means of wealth and self-aggrandisement. And if all the world admires such men as these, can we complain of St. James for bidding us become such men as all the world admires? Ought we not, rather, to be thankful to him for teaching us how to meet the inevitable miseries of life so as to get good out of them, how to make all that is lacking in our outward lot contribute to the formation of a character that shall lack nothing?

In ver. 12 the Apostle sums up all that he has previously said. As he has mused over his theme his heart has taken fire, and he breaks out into the exclamation, "Happy is the man that endureth temptation!" or, "Happy is the man that endureth *trial*!" (for we have the same word here as in ver. 2, though St. James here begins to put darker

shades of meaning into it.) And in this exclamation he assumes that we shall *take* his previous counsels. He has bidden us rejoice when we fall into divers trials; now he pronounces us happy because we have endured them, because we have let patience have her perfect work, because we have sought wisdom of God, because we have risen to an unwavering faith. Elsewhere he says, "Behold, we count them happy that *endure*," calling our attention as to a saying of special worth by the interjection "behold!" And, indeed, we may easily see that it is not enough for our welfare that we should simply be *exposed* to trials, or that we should *suffer* them. If we are to get the good of them, if they are to refine and complete our character, we must *endure* them: *i.e.*, as the word implies, we must meet them with a *cheerful constancy*; we must so inure ourselves to them that we can go to them as the athlete goes to the exercises which develop his strength and courage, go to them with alacrity, with resolution, with pleasure, so that what is hard to others shall be easy to us, *counting it all joy* when we are summoned to the arena.

I know how hard all this sounds, and is, to the ordinary man. But St. James is not speaking to ordinary, but to Christian men. And what is a Christian but a man who is being made perfect—a man who, through the grace of God, lives a higher life than his fellows, and touches a purer happiness? And even if, as yet, we feel that we ourselves cannot endure heavy trials with cheerful fortitude, do we not count those happy who can? do we not wish we were as strong as they? We must admit, then, that St. James is simply uttering an obvious truth when he exclaims, "Happy is the man that *endureth* trial!"

But why is he happy? what is the special good that comes to him and raises him above the common level of humanity? The Apostle hints at one reward in the words, "when he is *approved*," and distinctly states another reward

of constancy in the words, "*he shall receive the crown of life.*" For the phrase, "when he is approved," points to a figure often employed both in the Old and New Testament Scriptures. Both the prophets and the apostles represent God as a refiner, who sits by the furnace, assaying and purifying gold and silver, and who, when He has purged them of their dross, stamps them as true metal of sterling worth. He has *proved* them, and He *approves* them. This is the image in the Apostle's mind when he speaks of men as proved and approved by trial. If they endure the fiery process by which they are purged from evil and defect, if they stand the tests which God applies to them, He approves of them; *i.e.* He declares them meet for the heavenly mint, and stamps His image and superscription upon them. So that even in the first phrase a twofold reward of constancy is indicated. If we bear our trials with a cheerful courage, they will purify and refine our character, purging us from those base admixtures by which we are weakened and impoverished. And, again, if we bear our trials with a cheerful courage, God will approve of us, and deign to use us for His service in His kingdom.

That a man should *like* trial for its own sake is no more to be expected than we could expect gold, were it rational and sensitive, to like the fire. But even gold, if it were *rational* as well as sensitive, might well be content to endure the furnace by which its purity and value are enhanced, by which its alloys and defects are searched out and purged away. Nor does St. James demand that we should like trial for its own sake, but for the sake of the happy effects it will produce on us if it be borne with constancy. All that he demands of us is that, since trials must and will befall us, since we cannot escape them, we should learn so to bear them as to turn them to good account, that we permit the inevitable furnace to melt our impurities out of us, that we make the fire a *refining* fire

instead of a consuming fire. And surely this is a demand which, if we are wise, we shall endeavour to meet. We shall not be any the more exempt from tribulation because we refuse to profit by it; we shall simply put away from us the benefit it is designed to confer. We shall simply be as gold, which must bear the flame, but refuses to be purified by it. Instead of being passed and approved by the great Refiner, we shall only compel Him, if His gracious purpose is to be fulfilled in us, to heat the furnace seven times hotter than its wont. How happy, then, is the man who endures trial with a cheerful constancy—happy in that his character is at once refined and approved!

This twofold reward we might deem sufficient. But God giveth liberally, with a full hand. To the cheerful endurer He is a cheerful Giver. And hence St. James goes on to promise "the crown of life" to as many as endure. But what is this crown of life? It is simply a life victorious and crowned; or, in other words, it is a royal and perfected character. Had St. Paul used this image, no doubt his allusion would have been to the garland adjudged to the victorious athlete in the Greek games. But we cannot suspect James, the *Jew*, to whom the sports of the arena and the amphitheatre were an abomination, of such an allusion. He would be thinking of the diadem of royalty, the crown of a king; and therefore on his lips the promise means that the man who is brave and constant under trial shall rise into a kingly life, into a noble and royal perfection of character; that he shall be "lord of himself," whatever he may lack; that he shall be marked out and distinguished above his fellows as *he* is who wears a crown.

Now I suppose there is no one thing that a thoughtful man, who takes his life earnestly, so much desires, as the reward St. James here promises to those who endure. In every one of us there are two men, two worlds, at strife,

each of which gains the upper hand at times, neither of which ceases to struggle for its lost supremacy. It is because of this duplicity, this doubleness of nature, and the incessant strife between them, that we are so restless, divided, perturbed. If we resolve to disregard conscience, to suppress our spiritual part, in order that we may serve the flesh and the world, we *cannot* suppress it. Do what we may, it will assert itself at times—yes, and at the most critical times—and assert its right to rule. On the other hand, if we resolve to deny the flesh with its lusts, to break with the world and the world's law, in order that we may obey the voice of conscience and walk after the Spirit, our habits and lusts refuse the yoke; they rise up in mutiny; they surprise us in our unguarded moments; they depose their rightful lord, and usurp authority over us. Thus, within the kingdom of the soul, there is constant war; we never continue in one stay; we are never long at rest. Yet what so hateful to us as this inward unrest and division? What is there that we so heartily crave as the power to rule ourselves, to exert a lawful and royal supremacy over passion and desire, to subdue, pacify, and harmonize the various and conflicting energies, whose ceaseless strife carries havoc through the soul?

Do we in very deed desire it, and desire it above all else? Is it our supreme craving that our bosom's lord should sit calmly and steadfastly on the throne, coercing every mutinous power, bringing down every high thought that would exalt itself against the law of God, and calling back every errant affection that would wander beyond its pale? St. James tells us how we may attain it. Trials, he says, come for this very end, to make us perfect and complete men. If we endure them with steadfast patience, they will work in us a noble character, a royal dignity; they will put a crown on our heads, the crown of life.

And, mark, he is not dealing with mere figures of speech;

or, rather, he *is* dealing with figures of speech, but with figures that simply and accurately express facts which we may all verify for ourselves. The phrase, "when he is approved," points to the figure of the refiner's furnace. But drop the figure, and is it not true, so true as to be a truism, that trials, wisely and bravely borne, refine and elevate character? Do not those who have patiently endured many sorrows acquire a gentleness, a tenderness, a quick sympathy—in one word, a refinement—which, to mere polish and ease of manner, is as tinsel to gold? That other phrase, "the crown of life," is also a figure, a figure which indicates the royalty of character that makes a man lord of himself and equal to any fate. And if, at first, the promise sounds a little extravagant, is it not nevertheless a true and literal statement of fact? Look around you and mark who are the men of whom you are most sure, whom everybody trusts, to whom all are glad to run for counsel or succour. Are they not those who have been put to many proofs, and have stood them, who have been tested by divers kinds of trial, and have borne them with manly resolution and cheerfulness? Are they not those who are known to have long ruled themselves in the fear of God, who have governed their passions and cravings with a firm hand; men who, when need was, have planted themselves against the world, and have overcome it? Ah! happy and blessed men! They have endured temptation, and they are approved by God and man. They have risen to that royal sway over themselves which is the true crown of a true life. The life eternal is theirs, even as they pass through the fleeting and changeful hours of time.

On the other hand, men who cannot withstand temptation, who cannot surmount trial, who are not masters of themselves if certain passions and cravings are excited within them, may be very lovable and kindly; *you* even love and admire them; but you cannot *depend* on them:

their life is not a crowned life; they have yet much to learn, and much to bear, and much to mend, before they can be made "rulers of many things," before even they can rule the kingdom that is within them.

Every part of St. James' promise, then, accords with the plain facts of human life. Trials borne with constancy do refine men, do manifestly win for them the approval of God, do give them a royal self-mastery and control.

But we must not expect to "receive" this promise until we have fulfilled its condition. The reward of constancy is only for the constant. This man, this happy man, of whom St. James speaks,

"is freed from servile bands
Of hope to rise or fear to fall;
Lord of himself, though not of lands,
And having nothing, yet hath all."

And we have not as yet reached that heroic height of virtue. How *may* we reach it? What is *the secret* of that constancy of which the reward is so great? The Apostle reveals this secret in the closing phrase of the verse. "The crown of life," he says, is promised "*to them that love Him*, i.e. to them that love God; or, as we cannot love the Father whom we have not seen without loving the brother whom we have seen, this crown is promised to those who love God and man. Those who *endure* are those who *love*. *Charity* is the secret of constancy; for the crown of life, which is promised to those who love, is conferred on those who endure. Obviously St. James regards the two terms as commensurable, as interchangeable. And St. Paul is of the same mind: "*Love endureth all things*." Both of them teach us that, if we would be constant under trials and temptations, love must be our ruling affection; both lead us to the familiar conclusion that, if we would be perfect, we must love the Lord our God with all our heart, and our neighbour as ourselves.

What trials love will cheerfully endure, what sacrifices it will gladly make, we all know in part. And surely we can all see for ourselves that nothing will make a man so steadfast under trial and temptation as a sincere and hearty love for the God who ordains the tests to which he is put, and for the men who will be benefited by his constancy in meeting those tests. What but this love for God and man was it that sustained Christ Himself when He endured the cross, despising the shame? What but this love is potent enough to make us stand fast in the evil day, in hours of weakness when inclination and opportunity conspire against us? He who is animated by the love of God, and who, nerved by that love, is ever studying how he may benefit his neighbours, is not likely to yield to passion, to evil impulses, to the lusts of the flesh, to the love of the world. His heart is preoccupied, and fortified by an affection mightier than all that can rise up against it.

If, then, we would endure, and so endure as to receive the crown of life, let us follow after charity, the bond of perfectness.

S. Cox.

THE ARAMAIC GOSPEL.

INDICATIONS OF TRANSLATION (*continued*).

IN tracing the occasional divergences in the common matter of the Synoptic Gospels to diverse vocalization of the same Aramaic consonants, and to a variant rendering of the same Aramaic word, to which our attention has hitherto been chiefly confined, we have presupposed that each writer had before him precisely the same text. We pass on now to consider instances in which, as the basis of our elucidation of the divergences in our Greek Gospels, we assume that, in process of transcription, various readings had crept into the MSS. of the Aramaic Gospel. The moment we posit a written document as the common source, we are bound to admit the possibility of errors of the scribe. Even in our Greek Testament MSS. which were written in the palmiest days of the Church's history, probably by command of the Roman emperor, on the finest parchment the world could produce, and presumably with the best talent the emperor could command, such errors are of frequent occurrence. And as to the MSS. of the Hebrew Scriptures, the evidence is overwhelming that the all but stereotyped uniformity of extant MSS. furnishes no criterion that the text was equally uniform in the first century of our era. We have shown in our February paper that some of our New Testament quotations presuppose a slightly different Hebrew text from that which our Hebrew Bibles present; and in the perusal of the Septuagint, the student who accustoms himself to retranslate the Greek into the original, in cases where it differs from the Masoretic text, finds in multitudes of instances that the difference of one Hebrew letter explains the divergent readings of the LXX. While if the study of the Targums be included, or of the fragments of Origen's

Hexapla, as preserved to us in the magnificent edition of Dr. Field, the indications of the unsettled state of the Hebrew text up to about 150 A.D. are proportionately increased.

It may be well for the reader to turn to pp. 119–121, where we have shown that some of our New Testament quotations presuppose a slightly different text from that which the Masoretic tradition has preserved; and one other illustration may perhaps pertinently be here adduced.

Romans xii. 19: Vengeance is Mine, I will recompense.

Dent. xxxii. 35: Vengeance is Mine and recompense.

„ LXX.: In the day of vengeance, I will recompense.

„ Sam. Pent.: In the day of vengeance and recompense.

The Hebrew text which these readings respectively presuppose is as follows:

לִי נָקָם אֲשֶׁלֶם
 לִי נָקָם וְשֶׁלֶם
 לְיוֹם נָקָם אֲשֶׁלֶם
 לְיוֹם נָקָם וְשֶׁלֶם

The consideration of the foregoing facts prepares us to admit that, in a community of poor and comparatively unlearned men, as the first Palestinian Christians undoubtedly were, the manuscripts of the earliest Gospel cannot be assumed to have been free from errors of the scribe; and if written on perishable papyrus, they would be the more difficult to decipher, and thus various readings would the more rapidly be increased. We proceed now therefore to discuss the instances in which *the misreading or miswriting of one letter in an Aramaic document would lead to the divergences in the common matter of our Synoptic Gospels*. But before passing on to new cases, we will, for the sake of completeness, briefly cite those of this class which have been incidentally alluded to in our previous papers.

1. Matt. xiii. 6 :	διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν ῥίζαν	שרש
Luke viii. 6 :	διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν ἰκμάδα	שרף
2. Mark ix. 18 :	τριζει τοὺς ὀδόντας	חרק בשנין
Luke ix. 39 :	μόγισ ἀποχωρεῖ	שרק בענין
3. Matt. vi. 12 :	ὡς καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀφήκαμεν	קָמָא
Luke xi. 4 :	καὶ γὰρ αὐτοὶ ἀφίεμεν	קָמָא
4. Matt. xvii. 1 :	εἰς ὄρος ὑψηλόν	עלאה
Luke ix. 28 :	εἰς τὸ ὄρος προσεύξασθαι	צללה

5. We proceed now to new cases. There are two very common Aramaic words, קָרָא and קָרַב, which are manifestly alike. The former means to call, call for, name: the latter, to draw near; Pael, to cause to come near, to bring near. Now if in two passages which possess strong features of resemblance we find a verb "to call for" lying in the Harmony abreast of a verb "to bring near," we shall regard this as evidence of the kind of which we are in search, in support of our thesis that the variation in one letter in the Aramaic MSS. has in many cases occasioned the divergence in our Greek Gospels.

In connexion with the healing of Bartimæus, who sat begging near the gates of Jericho, and who cried for mercy when he heard that Jesus of Nazareth was passing by, the conduct of Jesus is described in slightly variant language.

MARK x. 49.
καὶ στὰς ὁ Ἰησοῦς
εἶπεν
αὐτὸν φωνηθῆναι.

LUKE xviii. 40.
σταθεὶς δὲ Ἰησοῦς
ἐκέλευσεν
αὐτὸν ἀχθῆναι.

Thus we notice that while Mark says, "He commanded him to be *called*," Luke says, "He commanded him to be *brought*." On the second line we have two words almost synonymous in this connexion, εἶπεν and ἐκέλευσεν, and we would suggest the word קָנַח as the original—a word which, both in Hebrew and Aramaic, means to speak, but which also denotes a gentle command. In our English Bible

אָמַר is rendered by the word "command" twenty-nine times, and "bid" thirteen times. We believe then, that in the two exemplars from which our passage was derived, there was simply this difference :

Mark	אָמַר דִּיתְקַרָּא
Luke	אָמַר דִּיתְקַרְב

The suitability of the verbs קָרָא (1) and קָרְב (2) scarcely calls for illustration, but we cite one or two cases of each as specially apposite.

(1) 1 Sam. iii. 8 : Here am I ; for thou didst *call* me.

Esther ii. 14 : She came in no more unto the king, unless . . . she were *called* by name pronounced and written.

Esther iv. 11 : I have not been *called* (אֶתְקַרֵּיתִי לָא) to come in unto the king these thirty days.

(2) Gen. xlviii. 8, 9 : And Israel saw Joseph's sons, and he said, . . . *Bring them near* unto me, that I may bless them.

Exod. xxii. 8 : The master of the house (to whom property had been entrusted which was afterwards stolen) *shall be brought* unto the Elohim.

There is one remark I would like to make on this passage before leaving it. It will be noticed that in Mark I have quoted a reading not approved by our Revised Version. This is almost the only instance in which I shall do this. I have all but invariably found that the revised readings yield best to our hypothesis ; indeed, many a precious hour has been wasted by neglecting to rectify the text of Stroud or Greswell, and applying our method to second-rate readings. All truth is mutually confirmatory ; and it cannot but interest those who have been devoting so much valuable time to textual criticism of the New Testament to be informed that the theory of a primitive Aramaic Gospel in almost every case supports the readings of the Revised Version, and shows them to be the oldest. In the case before us however the Revisers,

with B, C, L, Δ, S, read *εἶπεν φωνήσατε αὐτόν*, "He said, Call ye him," instead of *εἶπεν αὐτόν φωνηθῆναι*, which is supported by A, D, and the remaining MSS., and also by the Syriac. Subjective criticism suggests that the rare use of *εἶπεν* in the sense of command caused at an early date the change to the *oratio recta*; and this suggestion is confirmed by our hypothesis, as well as by the Syriac versions, which do not always receive the full weight they deserve.

6. We would next turn to the narrative of the woman with the issue of blood, where we shall find two cases in which our present point is illustrated. In describing the previous efforts which the woman had made to find a remedy for her disease before she came to Christ, we have two parallel expressions:

Mark v. 26: *δαπανήσασα τὰ παρ' αὐτῆς πάντα.*

Having spent all that she had.

Luke viii. 43: *προσαναλώσασα ὅλον τὸν βίον.*

Having squandered all her living.

The two participles are almost synonymous, and we would suggest that the original Aramaic word was *ܘܒܝܘܘܢ*, to spend up, to spend to the very last. It occurs Ecclesiastes iii. 22, where the Targum amplifies the Hebrew text thus: "Why should I squander my money to destroy my righteousness? It is well for me to leave it to my son after me, or to support myself from it in the time of my old age."

As for the rest, *τὰ παρ' αὐτῆς πάντα* = "all that belonged to her," or, "all that she had," this would be *ܟܠ ܕܠܗܐ ܟܠ* or *ܟܠ ܟܘܢܗܐ*; whereas *ὅλον τὸν βίον*, "all her living," is *ܟܠ ܟܘܢܗܐ*. The noun *ܟܘܢܗܐ* has a peculiar interest, as disclosing the astrological pursuits of which the Jews were so fond, and which made "wandering Jews" the gypsies of the first Christian century. It denotes (1) a planet,

especially Jupiter; (2) fortune, fate; and (3) wealth, substance, means of living. In this last sense it occurs in the Targum as the equivalent of the Hebrew יָדָה .

Prov. xxix. 3: He that keepeth company with harlots squanders his *living* (יָדָה).

Prov. xix. 4: *Wealth* addeth many friends; but poverty separateth one's friend from him.

Ps. cxix. 14: In the way of Thy testimonies I have rejoiced, as much as in all *riches*.

7. In the same narrative, when the evangelists describe the suddenness of the cure effected by touching the fringe of the Saviour's shawl, we have an interesting divergence:

MARK v. 29.
καὶ ἐθέως
ἐξήρανόθη
ἡ πηγὴ
τοῦ αἵματος αὐτῆς.

LUKE viii. 44.
καὶ παραχρῆμα
ἔστη
ἡ ρύσις
τοῦ αἵματος αὐτῆς.

This furnishes us a fair specimen of the Synoptic problem. The resemblance in the order and number of the words is too close to allow us to suppose absolute independence. The diversity is too great to admit the theory of mutual use. If either evangelist had access to the work of the other, we cannot suppose that either would be so capricious as to exchange *ἐθέως* for *παραχρῆμα*. There remains then our theory of translation from a common source. On this theory it is perfectly natural that we should have the same number and order of words, synonymous words and phrases, and also, from various causes, some little diversity. On this theory it is the most natural thing possible that an Aramaic word הַבִּיל or בְּפִרְיֵעַ = immediately, should be translated in one case *ἐθέως* and in the other *παραχρῆμα*; and that the word אַרְיָתָא , which denotes (1) a pool or fountain, "stagnum, fons," as in Ps. cviii. 35, "He made the wilderness to be like a *pool* of

water"; and (2) a stream, "rivus," as in Psalm lxxviii. 44, "He turned their *streams* into blood," should be rendered by the two translators *πηγή*, a fountain; *ρύσις*, a stream—especially when we find that this same word, with the prosthetic *Ṣ* dropped, was used in rabbinic literature in the technical sense required by the context. Then we have the parallels *ἐξηράνθη* = "was dried up," and *ἔστη* = "stood still." These are not quite synonymous, but can be explained by the change in one single letter. The Aramaic equivalent of *ἐξηράνθη* is *אתנניב*, and the aptness of the word to the context will be clear from the following passages:

- Gen. viii. 13: The waters were *dried up* from off the earth.
 Job xiv. 11: The waters departed from the Red Sea; . . . and Jordan was *dried up* and parched before the ark of Jehovah, and returned to the place of its sources.
 Ps. cvi. 9: He rebuked the Red Sea, and it was *dried up* (*אתנניב*). In rabbinic literature the verb is regularly used of drying the hands after washing, and the body after bathing.

We believe then that the word which stood in the Aramaic MS. used by Mark was *אתנניב*; but if we suppose that, instead of this word, the MS. used by the evangelist Luke contained, or seemed to contain, *אתנציב*, there would be no resource for him but to translate this word after the analogy of the Hebrew *נָצַב* or *הִתְיַצַּב*, "stood still," *ἔστη*. This is the more probable, as we have noticed with a frequency almost approaching to a "law," that Luke is prone to decipher his exemplar as yielding a Hebrew word, where the others translate an Aramaic word; or to give a Hebrew meaning to a word which exists with slightly diverse meanings in the two languages—thus implying that he was more familiar with Hebrew than with Aramaic.

8. We would now draw an illustration from the sermon on the mount:

MATT. v. 15.	MARK iv. 21.	LUKE viii. 16.	LUKE xi. 33.
οὐδὲ	μήτι	οὐδέϊς	οὐδέϊς
καίουσι	ἔρχεται	ἄψας	ἄψας
λίχρον	ὁ λίχρος,	λίχρον	λίχρον
καὶ τιθέασιν αὐτὸν	ἵνα τεθῆ	αὐτὸν τίθησιν	τίθησιν
ὑπὸ τὸν μῶδιον.	ὑπὸ τὸν μῶδιον ;	ὑποκάτω κλίνης.	ὑπὸ τὸν μῶδιον.

We have here clearly two variants : (1) "A lamp *does not come* that one may place it under the bushel" (Mark) ; and, (2) "One *does not kindle* a lamp and place it under the bushel." Can it be a mere accidental circumstance that the verb "to come" is **ܢܬܢ**, and the verb "to kindle" is **ܢܝܢ**? It is needless to adduce illustrations of **ܢܬܢ**, which is in the Targums the constant equivalent of the Hebrew **נָתַן** ; and is, by the way, preserved in the New Testament, in the watchword of the early Christians, **ܡܪܢܢܐܬܐ**, Maran atha, Our Lord cometh. The suitability of **ܢܝܢ** to the context is clear from the following Targumic passages :

Isa. xlv. 15 : The prophet, in exposing the folly of idolatry, says of some of the wood from which the god is made, "he *kindleth* it (LXX. *καύσαντες*), and baketh bread."

Hosea vii. 4 : Like an oven which the baker *kindles* for himself.

The presence of *καίω* and *ἄπτομαι* is quite in harmony with our theory, but not sufficient of itself to substantiate it. It would be venturesome to assert from this evidence alone that **ܢܝܢ** stood in the *Urschrift* ; but when we have the decided variant *ἔρχεται* = **ܢܬܢ**, then we have veritable evidence as to the original text.

9. Another instance in which **ܢܬܢ**, or, as it is often written, **ܢܬܢ**, seems to have been mistaken for another word is in the following passages :

Luke ix. 46 : *εἰσῆλθεν δὲ διαλογισμὸς ἐν αὐτοῖς.*

A reasoning entered among them.

Mark ix. 34 : *πρὸς ἀλλήλους γὰρ διελέχθησαν.*

For they reasoned among themselves.

These two passages are strictly parallel. Each is in-

troductory to the placing of the child in the midst as the example of humility, and yet we have this interesting diversity. It must be felt that *εἰσηλθεν* is used in an uncommon sense; and we would suggest as the solution that in the MS. used by Luke *אתי* was miswritten for *ארי*, the regular word meaning "for."

Luke's text requires: *אתי ביניהון תוכחא*
 Mark's *ארי ביניהון אתוכחו*

The last words in the couplets are respectively *תוכחא* = "controversy," and *אתתוכחו*, 3 pl. Ithpael of *יכה*. This is the usual verb for argument or debate, in which each of the disputants tries to vindicate himself, or to establish his claim to the ownership of the thing under dispute. It occurs in Genesis xxi. 25, when Abraham asserted his claim to the well of water which the servants of Abimelech had violently taken away; and in 2 Samuel xix. 9, of the fierce controversy between the men of Israel, after the death of Absalom, as to whether they should return to their allegiance to David. Thus the verb and its cognate noun may well be used of the controversy among the disciples as to "which of them should be the greatest."

10. Let us now turn to a general statement as to Christ's activity in Galilee, which is given with substantial agreement in the second and third Gospels.

MARK i. 34.	LUKE iv. 41.
<i>καὶ τὰ δαιμόνια</i>	<i>καὶ ἐπιτιμῶν</i>
<i>οὐκ ἤφιε</i>	<i>οὐκ εἶα</i>
<i>λαλεῖν</i>	<i>ἀντὰ λαλεῖν,</i>
<i>ὅτι ἤδεισαν αὐτόν.</i>	<i>ὅτι ἤδεισαν αὐτὸν</i>
	<i>τὸν Χριστὸν εἶναι.</i>

Can any theory explain the phenomena in these two passages so satisfactorily as that of translation from a common document? It is not a description of any one event, but a summarized account of Christ's general activity.

The description is evidently cast in the same mould : phrase corresponds with phrase. The synonyms ἡφιε and εἶα preclude the theory of mutual use. All we need therefore to establish our theory is to show that in Aramaic the words "demon" and "rebuke" might easily be mistaken. Let us see if this is so. The most common word for "rebuke" is ܪܘܝܢ; and usually where it occurs in the Targums, the verb ἐπιτιμῶ occurs in the LXX. It occurs for instance :

Zech. iii. 2: Jehovah *rebuke* thee, O seducer!

Nahum i. 4: Who *rebuked* the sea.

Mal. iii. 11: Jehovah shall for you *rebuke* the devourer.

Num. xii. 14: If her father have merely *rebuked* her, shall she not be shut up seven days?

The equivalent of ἐπιτιμῶν is thus ܪܘܝܢܐ. But suppose that, instead of ܪܘܝܢܐ, the MS. of Mark contained, or seemed to contain, ܪܘܝܢܐ. This would mean "the injurious one," or "the malevolent one"—the Peal participle of the verb ܪܘܝܢ, which in Peal and Aphel alike means to injure; indeed the Aphel participle is regularly used as a noun, ܪܘܝܢܐ, a malevolent evil spirit, a demon; as for instance :

Ps. cvi. 37: They sacrificed to *demons* (LXX. δαιμονίοις).

Ps. xci. 5: Thou shalt not be afraid through fear of evil spirits (ܪܘܝܢܐ), which walk in darkness; nor of the arrow of the angel of death which he shooteth by day.

Cant. viii. 3: The paraphrast here describes the bride, *i.e.* Israel, as rejoicing that she is surrounded on the right hand and on the left by the incense of prayer, that it is not possible for an evil demon (ܪܘܝܢܐ) to hurt her.

The Peal participle ܪܘܝܢܐ is then, we believe, rendered by the meaning which it shares in common with the more frequent Aphel participle ܪܘܝܢܐ = the malevolent one: δαιμόνιον.

11. In the account of the healing of the demoniac boy after the transfiguration there are two interesting varia-

tions in the words which the distressed father addresses to the Saviour as he comes to meet Him.

MATT. xvii. 15.

Κύριε,
ἐλέησόν
μου τὸν υἱόν.

MARK ix. 17.

Διδάσκαλε,
ἤνεγκα
τὸν υἱόν μου.

LUKE ix. 38.

Διδάσκαλε,
δέομαί σου ἐπιβλέψαι
ἐπὶ τὸν υἱόν μου.

There are found in the Targums two words which are used of earnest, impassioned entreaty for pity or help. These are **בְּבַעֵי** or **בְּבַעֵית**, and **בְּמַטֵּי** or **בְּמַטֵּית**. The former is a noun **בַּעֵי**, from the verb **בָּעַי**, to pray or appeal, with the prefix **בְּ**; and in this form is used as an interjection, like the Hebrew **בִּי**.

Gen. xix. 18:

Lot said, O now, my lords.

Gen. xxiii. 11 (Jonathan):

I-beseech-thee (**בְּבַעֵי**), my lord, hear me.

Gen. xxii. (Jerusalem):

Oh for mercy (*i.e.* I pray for mercy, **בְּבַעֵי רַחֲמֵי**), that when the sons of Isaac come in the hour of their distress, Thou mayest remember for them the binding of Isaac their father, and remit and forgive their sins.

The phrase **בְּבַעֵי רַחֲמֵי**, in which it will be observed that **בְּבַעֵי** stands as an accusative to the interjection, occurs twice in this prayer of Abraham.

The word **בְּמַטֵּי** is found only in the Targum of Jonathan, and is apparently precisely the equivalent of **בְּבַעֵית**, being used in Jonathan where Onkelos has **בְּבַעֵית**; *e.g.* twice in Judah's appeal, Genesis xliii. 20 and Genesis xliv. 18. I have failed however to find an instance in which **בְּמַטֵּי** is followed by an accusative, as **בְּבַעֵי** is; but this is doubtless due to the scantiness of our literature. I suggest then that the common text, of which Matthew and Luke give a free translation, was **בְּמַטֵּית בְּרִי**, O my son! I pray for my son!

Instead of this, Mark has "I brought my son"; but the verb "to bring" is אָבִיט, Aphel of אָבִיט.

- Gen. xxvii. 25 (Jonathau): Esau brought it (venison) to his father.
 Exod. xxii. 12, J: If a beast entrusted to a neighbour to keep be torn by wild beasts, he shall bring the owner to the torn body.
 Lev. ii. 8, J: He shall bring it to the altar.

In accordance with this conjecture then, we would reproduce the original passages thus:

I brought my son = אָבִיט בְּרִי
 I pray for my son = בְּמִטּוֹת בְּרִי

12. Under the word אָבִיט, Buxtorf in his lexicon, suggests that as בָּעֵי comes from the verb בָּעָא = to beseech, so there must have been a word אָבִיט which also meant to beseech, though this meaning does not seem to attach to the word in extant literature. The verb אָבִיט means to arrive, alight upon, happen; so that if it possessed also the meaning of "beseeching," it would be precisely after the analogy of the Greek word ἐντυγχάνω. That it did possess this force is, we think, rendered clear from a passage in the narrative we have just had under our consideration.

- Matt. xvii. 16: I brought him to Thy disciples.
 Mark ix. 18: I spake to Thy disciples.
 Luke ix. 40: I besought Thy disciples.

Will it need any persuasion to convince my readers that we have here respectively

אָבִיט אָבִיט אָבִיט?

We would suggest that the last was the original reading; but being of rare occurrence, it was translated, or replaced in the hands of the copyists, by two better known words.

13. In describing the healing of the leper who came to Christ in the first days of His ministry, with such wondrous faith, saying, "If Thou art willing, Thou art able

to cleanse me," we find different phrases used to describe the fact of his recovery.

Matt. viii. 3: His leprosy was cleansed.

Luke v. 13: His leprosy departed from him.

Mark i. 42: His leprosy departed from him, and was cleansed.

We would suggest that this difference is due to a various reading: אֶתְנַקֵּת for אֶתְנַקָּה. The verb נקה in Pael means "to cleanse"; as in Isaiah i. 25, "And I will bring back the blow of My strength upon thee; and I will purify thy sins, as one who *cleanseth* with soap; and I will remove thy transgressions." The verb נָקַר is found in the Targum of Esther vi. 1, where the paraphrast, not content with stating that in that night sleep *departed* from king Ahasuerus, describes most volubly that sleep departed also from the Holy One, from Esther, from Haman, and from Mordecai. In each case we have in Buxtorf's edition of the Targum נָקַר, which Levy however, in his lexicon, corrects to נָקַת. The Ithpeal has the same meaning as the Peal, so that אֶתְנַקֵּתִיָּהּ אֶתְנַקֵּת would mean "his leprosy departed."

In the reading in Mark's Gospel, "His leprosy departed from him, *and* was cleansed," we have our first instance of a phenomenon which will before long engage our serious attention—doublets in Mark. We shall endeavour to show that the phenomenon to which Canon Driver has directed attention in his deeply instructive work on the books of Samuel, as a remarkable feature in the LXX., occurs also in our present text of Mark; that is to say, when a transcriber is acquainted with two translations of the original, in his uncertainty as to which is correct, he sometimes inserts *both*. We shall endeavour to show that the repetitions for which Mark's Gospel is famous have in most cases arisen from uncertainty as to the Aramaic reading, as in the case before us.

14. When our Lord had healed the man with the withered hand in the synagogue on the Sabbath day, the Pharisees were much enraged, and their subsequent action is thus described :

MATT. xii. 14.	MARK iii. 6.	LUKE vi. 11.
ἐξελθόντες	ἐξελθόντες	ἐπλήσθησαν
οἱ Φαρισαῖοι	οἱ Φαρισαῖοι	αὐτοὶ
	μετὰ τῶν Ἡρωδιανῶν	ἀνοίας·
συμβούλιον ἔλαβον	συμβούλιον εἰδίδουν	διελάλουν πρὸς ἀλλήλους,
ὅπως αὐτὸν ἀπολέσωσιν.	as Matt.	τί ἂν ποιήσειαν τῷ Ἰησοῦ.

In this brief passage there are three, if not four, of the lines in which the divergence can be explained by our hypothesis. On the first line we have ἐξελθόντες = "they went out," standing alongside ἐπλήσθησαν = "they were filled." But to express the idea of going out or away to a definite spot, or with a definite object in view, as in the case before us, the correct verb is ܘܢܩܬܐ: as we see from Numbers xxiii. 15, where Balaam says to Balak, "Stand here, while I go yonder," and 1 Samuel ix. 9, "Come, let us go to the seer"; whereas the regular verb, meaning "to be filled" is ܠܘܩܬܐ.

It will be noted that we place ἀνοίας abreast of τῶν Ἡρωδιανῶν in our harmony. We do this with some little hesitancy. If we had evidence that the popular name for the Herodians was "the men of the *stoa*"—the *stoa* being used in Talmudic writers for the hall or pavement at the gates of palaces, where the magnates sat to listen to cases of litigation—then we might feel at liberty to affirm that there had been a confusion between ܘܢܩܬܐ = a hall or pavement, and ܢܘܦܫܐ = folly, insanity. The latter word occurs Jeremiah xxviii. 16 and xxix. 32: and the crime of Haniah and Shemaiah was just the same as that of which the Pharisees were guilty—malignantly opposing God's truth. But until the desired evidence is forthcoming we would not speak with confidence.

15. Further, it will be noted that while Matthew and Mark say, "they took counsel," Luke says, "they conversed with each other." This is precisely the difference between אֲתִמְלִיכוּן and אֲתִמְלִילוּן, as the following passages show :

- Ps. lxii. 4: When they swear to show kindness, they *are consulting* (מִתְמַלְכִין) to cast him down: they bless with their mouth, but they curse secretly.
- Ps. lxxi. 10: They that watch for my soul *take counsel together*.
- Exod. xxxii. 11, J: God conversed (מִתְמַלְלֵל) with Moses.
- Num. vii. 89, J: When Moses went in to speak with Him, he heard the voice which *conversed* with him from upon the mercy seat.

16. In the last line, it is abundantly clear that the difference between ἀπολέσωσιν and ποιήσειαν is due to a confusion between אֲבַד, to destroy, and עָבַד, to do. In Hebrew עָבַד regularly means to work, serve, but is almost invariably used in the Targums as the equivalent of עָשָׂה, to do, which latter word is in the Targums never once to be seen.

17. Our space will admit of but one more illustration. It shall be taken from the prediction of the Saviour as to His second advent.

MATT. xxiv. 23 and MARK xiii. 21.

τότε ἐάν τις ὑμῖν εἴπῃ,
Ἴδού, ὦδε ὁ Χριστός,
Ἴδού, ἐκεῖ,
μὴ πιστεύσητε.

LUKE xvii. 23.

καὶ ἐροῦσιν ὑμῖν,
Ἴδού, ὦδε,
Ἴδού, ἐκεῖ.
μὴ ἀπέλθῃτε,
μηδὲ διώξῃτε.

Thus when, to those who are perplexed by numerous claims of different persons to the Messiahship, the Lord Jesus gives advice as to how His disciples were to act, we find that two of the evangelists record his words to have been: "Do not believe," or "do not trust in them":

while Luke says, "Do not depart," "Go not away from them, nor pursue after them"; remain tranquil. This is just the difference between לֹא תִתְרַחֵקוּן and לֹא תִתְרַחֲצוּן. The following quotations from the Targums make this abundantly clear.

- Ps. cxlvi. 3: Do not *trust* in princes (לֹא תִתְרַחֲצוּן).
 Jer. vii. 4: *Trust* not in the words of the false prophet.
 Jer. xvii. 5: Cursed is the man that *trusteth* in man.
 Ps. xxv. 2: O my God, in Thee have I *trusted*.

Then as instances of אֶתְרַחֵק, to go far away, to go to a distance, depart, we may quote :

- Isa. xxxiii. 8: Because they have changed My covenant, they have *gone away* from their cities: man does not think of the evil that is coming upon him.
 Ezek. viii. 6: Son of man, seest thou what these do? the many abominations which the house of Israel are doing there, that I should *go far away* from them.
 Ezek. xi. 15: Son of man, thy brethren have said, *Get you far away* from the Lord.

If the MS. used by Luke read תִּתְרַחֵקוּן, and conformity with this rendered necessary the translation $\mu\eta\ \acute{\alpha}\pi\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\theta\eta\tau\epsilon$, we are not surprised at the addition $\mu\eta\delta\acute{\epsilon}\ \delta\iota\omega\acute{\xi}\eta\tau\epsilon$.

In our next paper we intend to adduce evidence that the *Logia* contained some of the peculiarities of dialect which are found in the Samaritan Targum; and that the uncertainty caused by the dialectical forms has led in many cases to the divergent renderings found in our Greek Gospels.

J. T. MARSHALL.

BREVIA.

Book-jewels (*Bücherkleinode*).—This is a German counterpart to “books which have influenced me,” a collection of autobiographic papers which some readers may remember. It contains lists of books which have had the greatest influence on a number of German theologians, both professors and pastors, contributed by these divines themselves, with explanatory remarks. Need it be said that Delitzsch is one of the writers? Dr. Curtiss appears to have overlooked this in his very interesting memorial sketch of Delitzsch. True, there is nothing which he need have quoted, but the phraseology is characteristic, and a few lines may therefore be given here. “My education and scholastic instruction were rationalistic; the person of Jesus Christ remained shrouded in mist for me till my university time began in 1831. He remained so, as long as I sought truth and satisfaction in philosophy, through the fascination of the elder Fichte. But when He who is the truth and the life revealed Himself to me, the ascetic literature of our Church became to me the element of life.” The names which Delitzsch then gives are known to us already through Dr. Curtiss. But one of them deserves to be more correctly printed; it is not Nedderesn, but Neddersen, whose “unpretentious book” never ceased to be Delitzsch’s “dearest *vade-mecum*.” The author was a schoolmaster in East Friesland.

Delitzsch’s friends and colleagues, Gustav Baur, Lechler, and Luthardt, also figure here. The first of these gives the fullest account of his inner life. Schleiermacher, Tholuck, Hegel, Billroth, and Nitzsch are the authors to whom he professes himself to have been most indebted as a young student. But listen to this interesting sentence: “I can almost say that single utterances have done more for me than books. Tauler’s fine saying, ‘Where God is to enter, all other things must go out,’ is one of them. Another is this of Schiller, ‘The truly excellent character is made up of strictness towards oneself and mildness towards others.’” Of course, this lover of Dante lays stress in conclusion on the store of high teaching to be found in the *Divina Commedia*.

Lechler has much to say of the moral and intellectual stimulus which he received from England. Bentley’s *Remarks on a Late*

Discourse of Freethinking (1713) and Paley's *Horæ Paulinæ* (1790) are highly commended; also Vinet's *Essai sur la manifestation des convictions religieuses* (1842), for the light which it throws on the ethical contents of the gospel.

Luthardt gives a long list of books. The first two mentioned will surprise the reader. They are Nægelsbach's works on Homeric and post-Homeric theology. Then follow, among others, Thomasius' *Dogmatik*, Hofmann's works, Luther's sermons and his chief works, Shakespeare's principal dramas, Pascal's *Pensées*, the first part of Goethe's *Faust*, and especially the same poet's *Iphigenie*; lastly, among the ancients, Demosthenes and Sophocles.

Two other lists of *book-jewels* may be referred to—those of Siegfried (the Hebraist and student of Philo) and Schürer (whose great work on New Testament times has been translated). The former begins with Herodotus, "the eternal model of the historical view of things." He continues with Goethe's *Wahrheit und Dichtung*, "a secular bible"; Herder's *Geist der Hebräischen Poesie*, "a book which one has never done with reading, ever fresh as the hind of the dawn (Ps. xxii., title)"; Shakespeare's *Macbeth*, "for the development of sin"; Philo, "the foster-father of the old Christian exegesis"; Luther, "especially his exposition of Genesis"; Schleiermacher's *Reden über die Religion*; Ranke's *Deutsche Geschichte im Zeitalter der Reformation*; Hupfeld, *Beleuchtung dunkler Stellen in der alttestamentlichen Textgeschichte*.

Schürer mentions some important works by Rothe, Bleek, Schleiermacher, Ritschl, Wellhausen, and Harnack respectively. Rothe leads the way, because he once for all taught Schürer "that not only a living piety, but also a well-founded positive theology, is consistent with the freest attitude towards Holy Scripture."

Some of the less known writers shine by the beauty and suggestiveness of the comments on their favourite books (some of which are now and again English). Students of theology might do much worse than get *Book-jewels*. I am sorry that I have waited so long to draw attention to it. The publisher is Perthes, of Gotha.

1 Kings x. 22.—"Once every three years came the navy of Tarshish, bringing gold and silver, ivory, and apes, and peacocks." The usual explanation of תַּרְשִׁישִׁי and תַּרְשִׁישִׁי connects these words with the Sanskrit *kupi* (ape) and the Tamil *tôgai* (peacock) respectively. It hangs together with the theory, already held

by Josephus (*Ant.* viii. 6, 4), that Ophir was somewhere on the Indian coasts, perhaps Abhîra, on the east bank of the Indus. But M. Halévy, placing Ophir in South Arabia, suggests that *kôfîm* and *tukkiyyîm* are the Hebraized forms, though in inverse order, of the *tuki kukupi*, which figure so often in the requests of the Asiatic princes in the (cuneiform) Tel el-Amarna inscriptions; *i.e.* bottles filled with perfumes derived from the spices of South Arabia. Comp. *κῶφι*, an Egyptian medicine mentioned by Dioscorides. "I think," says M. Halévy, "that the importation of perfumes during the luxurious reign of Solomon is much more probable than that of apes and peacocks" (*Revue des études juives*, avril-juin, 1890, pp. 63, 64). Still we do know that the Egyptian and Asiatic kings whom Solomon imitated thought a good deal of curious foreign animals.

Isaiah xix. 18.—"One shall be called The city of destruction." So the Revised Version renders, with the margin, "Or, *Heres*; or, according to another reading, *the sun*." In a valuable posthumous work by Riehm (*Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, ii. 552, 553), there is a thorough discussion of the competing readings, including that of the Septuagint, omitted in Revised Version, *viz.* "City of righteousness," which has been lately adopted by Kuenen and Dillmann. I cannot but think at present that Riehm's argument is better than Dillmann's; the former comes to the conclusion that the original reading was, "City of the sun," *i.e.* Heliopolis. Dillmann's objection (which was my own too in *The Prophecies of Isaiah*), that Onias, according to Josephus, appealed to ver. 19, not to ver. 18 *b*, is answered by the remark that the temple of Onias was not at Heliopolis, but at Leontopolis. Riehm points out too that in ver. 25 the Septuagint clearly expresses Egyptian-Jewish feeling; ἀσεδέκ (הצדק) is therefore probably an Egyptian-Jewish alteration for ההרם.

Tatian's "Diatessaron."—Professor Moore remarks in a paper on this subject in the same magazine (*Journal of Biblical Literature*, 1890), that the way in which the author treats his sources is full of instruction for the friends and foes of Hexateuch analysis. For an answer to a good many of the common arguments against the analysis, it will be sufficient, as this careful scholar may be thought to have shown, to refer to Tatian.

T. K. CHEYNE.

Critical Note on Psalm cxix. 122.—It is hardly necessary to remind readers of THE EXPOSITOR that Psalm cxix. is constructed on a highly artificial plan. Its one hundred and seventy-six verses are divided into sections of eight verses, and each verse of each section begins with the same letter, the first taking א, and the rest the following letters of the alphabet in order. This device is carried through without any exception. Then the writer has selected ten words (מִשְׁפַּט, אַמְרָה, דָּבָר, אֲמוּנָה, מִצְוָה, חַק, פְּקָדָה, עֵרָה, דָּרֶךְ), indicating with various shades of meaning the law, which the psalm celebrates; and one of these words is found in every verse except ver. 122. The English version has misled many of the commentators as to this point; e.g. Perowne excepts also ver. 132 from the rule: "Look Thou upon me, and be merciful unto me, as Thou usest to do unto those that love Thy name"; but the Hebrew for "as Thou usest to do" is לְמִשְׁפַּט (Vulgate, *secundum iudicium*; LXX., κατὰ τὸ κρίμα). The *Speaker's Commentary* has the same error. Andrew Bonar excepts also ver. 84, which contains the same word מִשְׁפַּט. But ver. 122 seems to be a real exception; no one of the ten words occurs, nor any other word of similar meaning; nor, as far as I have been able to find, is there any various reading. Now when we find a writer of immense ingenuity and patience setting out to compose such a work as this; and when we find that he carries out his design with perfect accuracy in three hundred and fifty-one out of three hundred and fifty-two cases, are we not justified in saying that there *must* be some error of reading in the three hundred and fifty-second case? It seems *à priori* impossible that he should have allowed his design to be spoiled by one exception of this sort. And when we find that a trifling alteration in one word at once completes the perfection of the composition and improves the sense of the verse, we shall be strongly disposed to accept it as the probably correct reading.

The first clause of the verse reads at present, עֵרֵב עִבְדְּךָ לְטוֹב, translated, "Be surety for Thy servant for good"; explained by the *Speaker's Commentary*, "Be my surety or defence for good; i.e. that it may be well with me": which is at any rate vague. Substitute לְתוֹרָה for לְטוֹב, and a much more precise meaning is obtained: "Be surety for Thy servant in regard to the law." The psalmist is oppressed and persecuted, and his fear is, that by reason of this oppression he may be led to break the command-

ments of the Lord (vers. 84, 86, 87, 110, 115, 116, 134, etc.). Therefore he prays God to become His surety, not simply that it will be well with him, which is not his first concern, but that he will keep the law. If God undertakes to pledge Himself that His servant shall not fall, he will then be secure, the Lord having become his righteousness.

But can the corruption of the original reading be accounted for? It is a very ancient one, for the LXX. read as our Hebrew Bibles do (ἐκδέξαι τὸν δοῦλόν σου εἰς ἀγαθόν). Assuming then that the original reading was לתורהא, and remembering that in the older forms of the Hebrew alphabet א and ה were very similar, and ר and ב almost identical in form, we can easily see how (1) the ה might be dropped before the א which follows, and the more easily as תורה occurs twenty-five times in the psalm, and would therefore be written somewhat hastily and mechanically; and (2) the resultant לתוראל be mistaken for לתובאל, the sound of which would naturally suggest לטובאל, the present reading, just as *good* would be at once changed to *good* if we met it in writing or print.

The final ה once dropped, the rest follows almost inevitably. Nothing is commoner than the dropping out of a letter when followed by the same letter; and that ה and א (the letter which follows) were so much alike as to be readily mistaken for one another may be inferred from such passages as Psalm cxxx. 4, where the received text has תורא; but there is a well-supported variant תורה. An instance of ה dropped before a following ה may be found in 1 Samuel i. 28, where the text has היהוה, but four MSS. read היהוא; or, more exactly like our own case, in Isaiah lx. 9 the text has בראשנה, but there is a variant כבראשנה, where כ has fallen out before ב, not the same, but a similar letter. The reading having thus become לתור, which would make no sense, the scribe would almost automatically read the ר as ב, the ancient forms being almost identical, giving לתוב, which he would judge to be meant for לטוב, and write accordingly, טוב being an exceedingly familiar word.

Such an explanation being possible, it seems easier to believe that it is correct in this case, than to think that the writer of the psalm spoilt its perfection as an artificial composition by intentionally breaking his rule in this one verse.

EDWARD H. SUGDEN.

INDEX.

PAGE

Rev. Professor T. G. Bonney, Sc.D., F.R.S.

Appendix to Dr. Perowne's "Notes on Genesis." The Mosaic and Geologic History	104
--	-----

Rev. Professor T. K. Cheyne, D.D.

Brevia :

Mr. G. A. Smith's <i>Exposition of Isaiah xl.-lxxvi.</i>	150
Psalms of Solomon	398
Isaiah lii. 15	400
Job v. 21	400
<i>Book-jewels</i>	468
1 Kings x. 22	469
Isaiah xix. 18	470
Tatian's <i>Diatessaron</i>	470

Rev. Samuel Cox, D.D.

The Prayer of Faith	32
Grave Reverses a Decisive Test of Character	195
The Blade of Grass	264
The Secret and the Reward of Constancy	443

The late Professor Franz Delitzsch.

The Descent of Christ into Hades. A Correspondence between Professor Franz Delitzsch and Professor von Hofmann	241, 361
--	----------

Rev. Professor Marcus Dods, D.D.

Survey of Recent English Literature on the New Testa- ment	142, 317
---	----------

	PAGE
Rev. Principal J. Oswald Dykes, D.D.	
The Self-Witness of the Son of God	54
Of Spiritual Bondage and Freedom	292
The late Rev. Professor W. G. Elmslie, D.D.	
Hosea	63
Joel	161
Habakkuk	427
Rev. G. H. Gwilliam, B.D.	
Is the Apostolic Liturgy quoted by St. Paul?	401
Professor von Hofmann.	
The Descent of Christ into Hades. A Correspondence between Professor Franz Delitzsch and Professor von Hofmann	241, 361
Rev. Professor James Iverach, D.D.	
The Ministry of Light	92
Rev. Professor J. T. Marshall, M.A.	
The Aramaic Gospel:	
Introductory	1
The New Criterion.	109
Indications of Translation	205, 275, 452
Dr. Resch's Proofs of Translation	375
Professor John Massie, M.A.	
Dr. Martineau and the Gospels	391
Right Rev. J. J. Stewart Perowne, D.D., Bishop of Worcester.	
Genesis and Science	42
Notes on Genesis	125
Rev. E. Petavel, D.D.	
The House of Gethsemane	220
Rev. Professor C. Pritchard, D.D., F.R.S.	
Genesis and Science	48, 52

Professor W. M. Ramsay, M.A.	PAGE
Glycerius the Deacon. The Story of a Heresy	321
Rev. Professor W. Sanday, D.D.	
On the Title, "Son of Man"	18
A Survey of the Synoptic Question :	
I. Recent Literature	81
II. and III. Points Proved or Probable	179, 302
IV. and V. New Hypotheses	345, 411
Professor Ramsay on the Geography of Asia Minor	232
Sir G. G. Stokes, M.P., F.R.S.	
Genesis and Science	42, 50
Rev. E. H. Sugden, B.A.	
Brevia: Critical Note on Psalm cxix. 122	471

INDEX TO TEXTS.

	PAGE		PAGE
Genesis i.	42, 104	Joel	161
i. 25	131	Habakkuk	427
i. 26	125	Matthew iv. 1, 2	190
i. 27	126	v. 48	212
ii. 1-3	132	vi. 12	281
iii. 21	129	x. 28	283
iii. 22	139	x. 38	276
ix. 4	130	x. 40	286
Exodus xii. 46	117	xi. 25	288
1 Kings x. 22	469	xii. 10	206
2 Chronicles xxiv. 20	394	xiii. 4	207
Job v. 21	400	xvi. 28	22
Psalms viii.	139	xviii. 6	289
ix. 18	313	xix. 4	127
xvi. 10	248	xxvi. 36	220
xxii. 1	11	xxvi. 51-53	258
lxviii. 19	362	Mark i. 12, 13	190
civ. 35	131	ii. 4	218
cxv. 17	250	ii. 6	285
cxix. 122	471	iii. 17	11
Proverbs viii. 30	131	v. 16	213
Isaiah xix. 18	470	vii. 34	11
liii. 4	275	ix. 1	22
xl.-lxvi.	150	ix. 18	210
lxi. 1	313	ix. 20	211
Ezekiel xxxix. 9	284	ix. 42	289
Daniel ii. 4	3	x. 43-45	25
vii. 1-14	21	xiv. 50, 51	222
Hosea	63	Luke iii. 23	283

	PAGE		PAGE
Luke iv. 1, 2	190	John xviii. 18	226
v. 19	218	xix. 36	117
v. 21	285	xxi. 7	228
vi. 36	212	Acts i. 18	221
viii. 5	207	ii. 24	243, 248
viii. 15	287	vii. 56	31
viii. 36	213	xii. 12	223
ix. 24.	278	Romans x. 7	245
ix. 27	22	1 Corinthians ii. 9	403
ix. 39	210	xi. 7	139, 140
ix. 42	211	xii. 10	362
x. 16	286	2 Corinthians iv. 1-6	92
x. 21	288	Ephesians iv. 8-10	242, 361
xi. 4	281	Colossians iii. 9, 10	141
xii. 5	283	iv. 10	229
xiv. 27	276	Hebrews ii. 10	370
xvii. 2	289	James i. 6-8	32
xvii. 33	278	i. 9-10	195
xix. 10	25	i. 10, 11	264
xxii. 47	227	i. 12	443
xxiii. 43	254	1 Peter iii. 18-20	259
John i. 42	11	iii. 19	242, 369
v. 31	56	v. 13	228
viii. 12-20	54	Revelation i. 18	246
viii. 31-36	292	ii. 8	251
xii. 6	221	xx. 4	251, 363

2



